education policy analysis archives
A peer-reviewed, independent, open access, multilingual journal

Arizona State University

Volume 20 Number 21 July 30th 2012 ISSN 1068-2341

Analyzing the Anglo-American Hegemony in the *Times Higher Education* Rankings

Amadu Jacky Kaba
Seton Hall University
USA

Citation: Kaba, A.J. (2012). Analyzing the Anglo-American hegemony in the *Times Higher Education* Rankings. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 20* (21). Retrieved [date], from http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/847

Abstract: This study analyzes the 2009 *Times Higher Education*-QS top 200 universities in the world. Based on this analysis the study claims that the THS reflects the phenomenon of Anglo-American hegemony. The United States with 54 universities and the United Kingdom with 29 dominated the THS. In addition, six out of every ten universities on the top 200 list were located in countries that were at one time partly or fully colonized by the United Kingdom. This study identifies a number of factors that contributed to a country having at least one university ranked on the list: Age of an institution, endowment of an institution, the size of a nation's population, gross domestic products (GDP) and GDP per capita, level of international trade (exports/imports), colonial heritage and language.
Keywords: Higher education; world-class universities; rankings; hegemony.

Analizando la hegemonía anglo-americana en los rankings de educación superior de la revista *Times Higher Education*
Resumen: Este estudio analiza el ranking de las 200 mejores universidades en el mundo de la revista *Times Higher Education*-2009. En base a este análisis, el estudio encontró que la THS refleja el fenómeno de la hegemonía angloamericana. Los Estados Unidos con 54universidades y 29 dominó

Journal website: http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/
Facebook: /EPAAAAPE
Twitter: @epaa_aape

Manuscript received: 10/14/2010
Revisions received: 03/20/2012
Accepted: 05/20/2012

el Reino Unido con la THS. Además, seis de cada diez universidades de la lista de los 200 mejores se encuentran en países que estaban parcial o completamente colonizado por el Reino Unido. Entre los factores citados por su contribución a un país que había al menos una universidad en el top 200 lista son los siguientes: Edad de la institución, la provisión de una institución del tamaño de la población de una nación, el producto interno bruto (PIB) y el PIB per cápita a nivel de comercio internacional (exportaciones/importaciones), la herencia colonial, y el lenguaje (Inglés).
Palabras clave: Educación superior; universidades de clase mundial; rankings; hegemonía.

Analisando a hegemonia anglo-americana nos Rankings da Educação Superior da *Times Higher Education*

Resumo: Este estudo analisa o ranking das 200 melhores universidades do mundo da Revista *Times Higher Education*-do ano de 2009. Com base nesta análise, o estudo afirma que a THS reflete o fenômeno da hegemonia anglo-americana. Os Estados Unidos com 54 universidades e o Reino Unido com 29 dominou a THS. Além disso, seis em cada dez universidades na lista das 200 melhores foram localizadas em países que foram parcial ou totalmente colonizados pelo Reino Unido. Entre os fatores citados por contribuir para que um país tivesse pelo menos uma universidade classificada na lista das 200 melhores estão: Idade de uma instituição, dotação de uma instituição, o tamanho da população de uma nação, produto interno bruto (PIB) e PIB per capita, nível de comércio internacional (exportações/importações), a herança colonial, e o idiomas (Inglês).
Palavras-chave: Ensino superior; universidades de classe mundial; rankings; hegemonia.

Introduction

On October 7, 2009, the *Chronicle of Higher Education* in the United States published on its "Ticker" web page a short article titled: "American Universities – and Oxford – Slip in Latest 'Top 200' List." The article was referring to the 2009 "*Times Higher Education*-QS [Quacuarelli Symonds Ltd.] World University Rankings 2009 Top 200 World Universities".[1] According to the Chronicle article, the U.S. has 32 institutions in the top 100 and 54 overall in the top 200, four short of the 58 in 2008. Four of the top six positions went to British institutions and the University of Oxford, was replaced in fourth place by University College London (The Ticker, 2009).

There have been many scholarly and newspaper and magazine publications discussing various aspects of college or university ranking reports such as the *Times Higher Education*-QS top 200 world universities rankings, the annual *U.S. News and World Report* College Rankings (U.S. only), Shanghai Jiaotong world university rankings, *Maclean's* annual university rankings, and *Newsweek* Global Universities rankings. According to Salmi and Saroyan (2007): "At this point, there are no fewer than 30 noteworthy rankings, ranging from broad rankings of national universities, such as *Maclean's* and *U.S. News and World Report*, to comprehensive international rankings, such as the *Times Higher Education Supplement* (THES) and Shanghai Jiao Tong University (SJTU)…" (p. 79).

Some of these scholarly articles express concern as to why such ranking reports are relevant since they do not include various kinds of prominent colleges and universities. Other scholarly publications are critical of the methodology utilized in producing such ranking reports. Yet, there are other scholarly articles that actually provide important analysis of the institutions ranked in such studies (Charon & Wauters, 2008; Clark, 2007; "College Rankings Criticized," 2007; Cramer & Page, 2007; Kamara, 2007; Lang & Zha, 2004; Larsen, 2003; Mohrman, 2008; Standifird, 2005).

[1] See Appendix A for the full rankings, including country and regional locations of each ranked institution; also see the following link for the list of ranked institutions as presented by *Times Higher Education*-QS [Quacuarelli Symonds Ltd.: http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/Rankings2009-Top200.html).

In a criticism of *U.S. News and World Report* College Rankings, it is noted that: "…such ratings are biased against historically Black institutions…" and that it focuses on "…financial resources, selectivity and peer assessment as indicators of which schools are most privileged, not which are best" ("College Rankings Criticized," 2007, p. 1). Writing about *Maclean's* rankings of tens of universities in Canada, Cramer and Page (2007) point out that, "The *Maclean's* rankings are reported in the idiom of winners and losers, with multiple references to where the best and brightest students may be found" (p. 5). Writing about the dilemma that institutions face whether to recognize the *U.S. News and World Report* College Rankings, Standifird (2005) notes that:

> …each year, schools throughout the USA seek to downplay the results while simultaneously attempting to create a positive spin for their position on the list. Like it or not, the *US News and World Report*…has become one of the premium benchmarks for ranking institutions of higher education within the USA (p. 233).

According to Larsen (2003): "While many in higher education question the validity of college rankings, the reality is that rankings do, indeed, have significant impact" (p. 155). In an article discussing the gradual impact of college or university rankings studies in Europe, Charon and Wauters (2008) write that rankings of universities are inevitable because they help students determine which institutions to attend or for researchers to determine where they want to work, or administrators to learn of the strengths and weaknesses of their institutions. That in recent decades the phenomenon of rankings itself in various areas of life such as athletics, academia or financial institutions has become accepted across the world due to the need for comparative information (p. 62).

Salmi and Saroyan (2007) also conducted a comprehensive study of this topic of university rankings by examining their numbers and characteristics, factors responsible for their creation, and arguments for both the positive and negative implications of ranking academic institutions, including the issue of Anglo-American hegemony or dominance. The article by Salmi and Saroyan (2007) presents information illustrating one aspect of Anglo-American hegemony—the imitation or emulation of those who seek to influence or control you. In this instance, increasing numbers of countries are attempting to imitate the higher education systems of the United States and the United Kingdom so that they could be elevated by an arm of these two powerful nations (the media), who serve as agents of influence for their nations.

In an article comparing Canadian and Chinese universities, Lang and Zha (2004) note that: "Comparison and emulation are components critical in institutional strategic planning. Peer comparisons can provide a basis for the rational evaluation of differences and of similarities among institutions, and of identifying relative strengths, weaknesses, and possible opportunities or niches" (p. 341). The Anglo-American hegemony in higher education becomes even more entrenched when a great nation such as China publically seek to emulate American and European (especially British) universities. For example, Mohrman (2008) discusses the Chinese government's intentions or efforts to emulate the positive characteristics of the prestigious universities in North America and Europe so that its research universities could be internationally recognized. As a result, rankings of universities across the world are useful because they would help in reform efforts by pointing to positive characteristics of universities considered great and highly ranked (p. 29; also see Ying & Niancai, 2008).

One important observation of reports or studies ranking colleges and universities is that they tend to focus on different variables thereby causing certain institutions to be ranked in different order, while other institutions might be ranked in one report or study but not ranked at all in other studies. For example, Appendix A includes both the 2009 *Times Higher Education*-QS top 200 world

universities rankings and the 2010 *U.S. News and World Report* College Rankings focusing on the 54 U.S. institutions ranked in the *Times Higher Education*-QS rankings. Next to the *U.S News and World Report* rankings in Appendix A is ranking of the U.S. public or state institutions on the list (in parenthesis with an asterisk next to it, comprising 26 (48.1% of the 54 total U.S. institutions).[2]

According to Appendix A, Harvard University and Yale University are ranked Number 1 and Number 3 respectively in both reports. However, while Princeton University is ranked Number 1 in the *U.S. News and World Report* rankings, it is ranked Number 8 in the *Times Higher Education*-QS rankings. While Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and California Institute of Technology are tied at Number 4 in the *U.S. News and World Report* rankings, they are ranked Number 9 and 10 respectively in the *Times Higher Education*-QS rankings (Appendix A). In a table (Table 1) of her study, Mohrman (2008) presents the 2006 rankings of colleges and universities by three ranking studies or reports: (1) Shanghai Jiaotong, based in China; (2) the *Times Higher Education*-QS; and (3) *Newsweek* Global Universities. Harvard was ranked Number 1 by all three, while University of Cambridge was ranked Number 2 by both Shanghai Jiaotong and *Times Higher Education*-QS, but ranked Number 6 by *Newsweek* Global Universities. Also, Stanford University was ranked Number 3 by Shanghai Jiaotong, but Number 6 by *Times Higher Education*-QS, and Number 2 by *Newsweek* Global Universities (p. 44).

These differences in rankings are a result of the variables or criteria examined by each study. For example, *Times Higher Education*-QS, which published its first report in 1994, focuses on the following seven variables or criteria by giving an institution a highest grade of 100: Peer Review Score, Employer Review Score, Staff/Student Score, Citations/Staff Score, International Staff Score, International Students Score, and Overall Score.[3] These criteria may be different from other rankings studies or publications. For example, for the *U.S. News and World Report* College Rankings, Morse and Flanigan (2009, August 19) present a detailed breakdown of the percentage points given to each of the variables or indicators they utilized: Donations by alumni (5%); Performance on graduation rates (5%, but this was limited to national universities and liberal arts colleges); Selectivity of students (15%); Resources for faculty (20%); Retention (20% for national universities and liberal arts colleges and also 20% for master's and baccalaureate colleges); and Peer Assessment (25%).[4]

In addition, one major difference between the Shanghai rankings versus the *Times Higher Education* is that the second one uses opinions from experts in selected countries. Another important issue regarding criteria is that both rankings consider mostly English publications to measure the impact of the research they conduct. Therefore as we shall soon learn an English-speaking country has more advantage over another whose mother tongue is not English.

The reasons then for utilizing the "Times Higher Education-QS World University Rankings 2009 Top 200 World Universities" is: to explain how these high number and proportion of colleges and universities from the United Kingdom and the United States combined show that these institutions are a major contributing factor for the visible Anglo-American hegemony in the past 100 years, including in military, politics (such as two votes among five permanent members of the UN Security Council), economy (such as the World Trade Organization); as already cited above,

---

[2] "Best Colleges: Top Public Schools: National Universities," *U.S. News and World Report*. Retrieved on November 27, 2009 from:http://colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-colleges/national-top-public.

[3] "*Times Higher Education*-QS World University Rankings 2009: Top 200 World Universities," *Times Higher Education Supplement* (UK). Retrieved on October 8, 2009 from: http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/Rankings2009-Top200.html.

[4] Morse, Robert., and Flanigan, Sam (2009, August, 19). "How We Calculated the College Rankings," *U.S. News and World Report*. Retrieved on October 11, 2009 from:http://www.usnews.com/articles/education/best-colleges/2009/08/19/how-we-calculate-th…

numerous respected scholarly journals have published articles that focused or included analysis of *Times Higher Education*-QS World University Rankings. This means that while there might be legitimate criticisms of their methodologies for selecting institutions, the work is useful to the point where it must be analyzed in articles published in recognized or respected journals; and this study does not focus on the actual rankings of colleges or universities, but the fact that an institution is actually on the list.

There is a strong case to be made that college and university ranking reports are not the best way to judge or measure the effectiveness of higher education institutions. However, one can also argue that regardless of how they got selected or their rank order, the 200 institutions on the *Times Higher Education*-QS world university rankings are highly productive and are considered 'World-Class' institutions (Deem et al., 2008; Lang, 2005; Mohrman, 2008, p. 42-45).

A substantial number of the institutions being examined in this study (especially those in the United States and the United Kingdom, such as Harvard, Princeton, Yale, Stanford and Oxford have the largest endowments. Most of them have not just world-class medical degree programs, but also world class hospitals attached to them. The political, economic, religious, and military elites in most countries of the world are trained at these institutions (Brezis & Crouzet, 2004; Swartz, 2008). For example, the current president of the United States, Barack Obama, was educated at two of these institutions (Columbia University and Harvard University) in the top 200 list and was a professor at another for many years (the University of Chicago). In addition, most parents all over the world do all they can to send their daughters and sons to these top 200 ranked institutions primarily because of their leading academic programs (Gose, 2000, p. A52). Also, a very high number or all of these institutions have become international universities, educating the elites of the world.

As Marginson (2007) notes, these institutions: "…have gained unprecedented visibility and immediacy in the global era. Their degrees and research carry exceptional credibility, and the leading group are household names: Harvard, Stanford, Berkeley, MIT, Caltech, Columbia, Princeton, Chicago, Yale, and Cornell in the United States and Cambridge and Oxford in the United Kingdom" (p.10). Cantwell and Maldonodo-Maldonado (2009) also present this account of how emerging nations, including those in the Arab and Muslim world take the *Times Higher Education* and other world university rankings very seriously: that in 2006 ministers of higher education from Islamic nations met in Kuwait City and that on their agenda was to discuss how they could come up with a plan to have up to ten of their universities ranked in the top 100 in the Shanghai Jiao Tong University rankings or the *Times Higher Education Supplement* rankings. This fact, according to the authors was very troubling to the ministers because not a single one of their universities was ranked in the top 100 of these two publications mentioned above. The ministers believed that to be a competitive rapid high-tech world economy, they needed world-class universities such as those ranked in those two publications mentioned (p. 296-297).

Cantwell and Maldonado-Maldonado (2009) also explained similar efforts in Mexico (p. 298-300). In these two examples they are actually aiding in the Anglo-American hegemony because they aspire to have their universities become like those highly ranked universities in the United States and the United Kingdom. This claim is also observed by Kumar and Verma (2009, p. 62).

This form of Anglo-American hegemony is what Lo (2011) calls "Soft Power" in an article that examines the issue of hegemony in world higher education system. According to Lo (2011), Western academic techniques and methods emphasize its superiority over middle and lower income nations, and as a result, these non-Western nations are indirectly influenced to emulate higher education policies of these dominant powers, especially the United States and United Kingdom — weak sovereignty. These Western nations may not even be aware of their hegemonic activities or

beliefs. Lo (2011) concludes by noting of "…the soft-power perspective as an alternative way to explain why non-Western countries are willing to follow the Anglo-American paradigm to develop their higher education systems" (p. 209). As a result, it is useful to provide an in-depth analysis of these top 200 institutions and the nations, territories or entities in which they are located.

This study presents an examination of the factors responsible for the inclusion or exclusion of colleges and universities in the top 200 world university rankings. The study utilized the world regional and sub-regional breakdown of the planet by the United Nations Statistics Division to determine whether all nations in those regions and sub-regions have equal number of colleges and universities represented in the top 200 list (also see Marginson, 2007, p. 13). Among the factors examined are the nation in which a ranked university is located; the total population of the nation, the sub-region and region; the Gross Domestic Products (GDP) and GDP per capita of the nation, sub-region and region; their 2009 United Nations Human Development rank; their 2008 trade figures (exports and imports); and the year 2007 Endowment figures for U.S. institutions on the list.

Methodology

I decided to take a more thorough examination of the institutions on the list for any interesting information. I decided to utilize the United Nations Statistics Division's classification of the regions and sub-regions of the world to determine which nations, territories or entities have at least one institution in the top 200 list. The UN Statistics Division broke down the world into five main regions (Africa, Americas, Asia, Europe, and Oceania) and 21 sub-regions: 5 for Africa; 3 for the Americas; 5 for Asia; 4 for Europe; and 4 for Oceania (Please see Appendix B). I counted 237 nations, territories and entities on the list and I added Taiwan to Asia because the UN did not include it but it is geographically located in Eastern Asia for a total of 238: 57 (23.9%) in Africa; 53 (22.3%) in the Americas; 52 (21.8%) in Europe; 51 (21.4%) in Asia; and 25 (10.5%) in Oceania.

I entered into Excel spreadsheet the regions, sub-regions and only nations or entities with institutions in the top 200 world university rankings, number of institutions, percent of sub-region, region, and world. I also added the following variables: the 2008 and 2009 population of Country; the 2008 GDP, and Per capita GDP; their 2008 exports and imports, including per capita; and 2007 endowments figures for the U.S. institutions on the list.

Furthermore, for the 54 U.S. institutions on the list, they were broken down into the states which have institutions listed and the states were broken down into the four main geographic regions of the country (Northeast, Midwest, South and West). Their 2008 population, GDP and GDP per capita were also provided for each of the 25 U.S. states (with Washington, D.C. as a state equivalent). Endowment figures for 2007 were presented for 52 of the 54 U.S. institutions on the list. I identified and recorded all of the 54 institutions in the 2010 *U.S. News and World Report* College Rankings.

For Canada, a breakdown was done for all of its 13 provinces to determine which ones had at least one institution in the top 200 world universities list. For those provinces, their 2008 population, GDP and GDP per capita figures (in Canadian dollars) are presented.

Finally, a table was created representing nations in Asia with Chinese majority populations, with institutions in the top 200 list. A table was created representing European Unions nations with institutions among the top 200 list. Finally, a table was created representing the United Kingdom and nations that were at one time in history part or all of their territories or land were partly or fully colonized by the United Kingdom. It is useful to note that both the 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbooks were utilized from October 8, 2009 to December 4, 2009. Before examining the statistics,

it is first important to conceptualize the word hegemony and its relations to Anglo-American dominance.

Conceptualizing Anglo-American Hegemony

A careful and substantial time of research on the concept of "hegemony" in academic or scholarly articles result in three interconnected observations. The first observation is that a very high proportion of the articles on hegemony identified the late Italian philosopher Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937) as one of the first scholars to conceptualize that word (also see Boothman, 2008). The second observation is that a substantial number of academic articles examined the concept of hegemony by linking it with Anglo-American dominance or imperialism. Third, the word hegemony has been conceptualized to understand many different phenomena, focusing on Western nations, especially the United States and the United Kingdom as the two entities that are dominating the world. For example, hegemony is examined through international media domination (Consalvo, 1998, pp.64-65; Gunn, 2006, pp. 559-576), political/military imperialism (Bill, 2001; Buckel & Fischer-Lescano, 2009; Kumar & Verma, 2009; Sementelli, 2005), cultural domination (Ashbolt, 2007; Jiang, 2011), and hegemony in comparative higher education (Collins and Rhoads, 2010; Mohrman 2008; Marginson, 2007; Olaniran & Agnello, 2008; Watson, 2009).

Examining Anglo-American hegemony in international higher education, Collins and Rhoads (2010) point to their concern pertaining to the influence of the World Bank (which is almost always headed by an American) and universities in the developing world. Pointing to what they consider a new form of global hegemony through the forms of "neocolonial" and "neoliberal" policies that bring developing countries in the line of thinking about higher education as it is done in the United States and European nations, particularly the United Kingdom. Collins and Rhoads (2010) add that " We see both ideas—neocolonialism and neoliberalism—as deriving to a great extent from the global economic interests of powerful nations like the United Kingdom and the United States…" (p. 182; also see Olaniran & Agnello, 2008, p. 71). Writing about challenges facing Chinese scholars in China, Mohrman (2008) points out that the importation into China of the research and publication pressure at top United States and United Kingdom universities puts enormous pressure on Chinese scholars, although they help to improve quality "… of higher education in China, but at the same time feel that they are victims of a kind of Western academic hegemony that they cannot refuse" (p. 39). Marginson (2007) writes of the world-wide influence of Ivy League institutions and American hegemony: "In policy circles everywhere, idealized templates of the Ivy League private university and the customer-focused commercial provider have an unprecedented sway….Every nation wants to have its own Harvard, although none can replicate the domestic conditions that have made U.S. higher education powerful. (Ironically, if all nations follow American templates, this will strengthen, not weaken, American hegemony.)" (p. 14). Watson (2009) notes of the increasing internationalization of higher education, with increasing adaptation of similar academic policies across nations, and that this trend "… inked to a growing hegemony regarding the 'scientization' of society, and of higher education itself" (p. 432).

Based on the research cited above, for this study, Anglo-American hegemony can be explained as both the United States and the United Kingdom using different methods to influence other nations to conform to or emulate the ways that these two powerful nations view the world and how they carry out policies, including functions of higher education institutions, approaches to political (their form of Democracy) and economic systems (Capitalism), or religious beliefs (Christianity and specifically Protestant Christianity). Both the United States and the United Kingdom are aided by their massive and influential media (including the *Times Higher Education*

Supplement) in achieving their goals or objectives through rational persuasion of other nations, threats or coercion, or war if necessary.

General Findings and Analysis

World

One would expect that since there are at least 238 nations, territories and entities in the world, there would be an almost equal distribution of the top 200 universities among almost all of these nations. However, one must not think that this will be a common expectation, especially within the field of higher education. Table 1 below helps to explain the Anglo-American hegemony of international higher education. Table 1 shows that only 32 (13.4% of 238) nations had at least one institution ranked in the top 200 ranked universities. Table 1 also shows the number and percentage of universities by each nation listed, the world regional location of each nation, and the rank of each nation on the 2009 United Nations Human Development Index. The United States and the United Kingdom dominated the list, with 54 (27%) and 29 (15%) universities respectively. A high majority of these 32 nations are ranked in the top 50 (out of over 190 nations total) of the 2009 UN Human Development Index (Table 1).

The total population of these 32 nations as of July 2009 was 3.87 billion (57% of 6.79 billion world total) (Compiled and Computed based on data in the CIA World Factbook, 2009). It is useful to note that population size of a nation should not be given too much emphasis because both China and India had over 2.3 billion people in 2008, but had a total of only 8 combined universities on the list, while both the United States and the United Kingdom had a total population of less than 370 million in 2008, but had 83 combined universities on the list. Also, the Netherlands with 16.7 million people had more universities on the list (11) than Germany with over 80 million people with 10 universities.

Table 2 below attempts to highlight the combined economic might of these 32 nations grouped in their world geographic regions. According to Table 2, the total population in July 2008 of these 32 nations was 3.84 billion (57.2% of 6.71 billion world total). Their total GDP as of 2008 was $54.132 trillion (77.2% of the Gross World Products of $70.14 trillion). Their average GDP per capita in 2008 was $14,112. The per capita Gross World Products in 2008 was $10,500 (Compiled and computed by author from Table 2). Europe has the highest total number of universities (85), followed by the Americas (66) and Asia (36). Table 2 also shows that although Europe (529 million people) and the Americas (447 million people) have far smaller populations than Asia (2.8 billion people), their GDPs are very high: $16 trillion for Europe; $17.3 trillion for the Americas; and $19.37 trillion for Asia. This is a very important factor that could have contributed to Europe and the Americas having more ranked universities than Asia and the rest of the world.

Table 1
Top 200 Universities by nation, region and 2009 UNDP Human Development Rank. (N =32 Nations)

Nation	Institutions (N)	%	World Region	UN HDI Rank 2009*
United States	54	27	Americas	13
United Kingdom	29	15	Europe	21
Canada	11	5.5	Americas	4
Japan	11	5.5	Asia	10
Netherlands	11	5.5	Europe	6
Germany	10	5	Oceania	22
Australia	9	4.5	Europe	2
China	6	3	Asia	92
Switzerland	6	3	Europe	9
Belgium	5	2.5	Europe	17
France	5	2.5	Europe	8
Hong Kong	5	2.5	Asia	24
Sweden	5	2.5	Europe	7
South Korea	4	2	Asia	26
Denmark	3	1.5	Europe	16
Israel	3	1.5	Asia	27
New Zealand	3	1.5	Oceania	20
India	2	1	Asia	134
Ireland	2	1	Europe	5
Norway	2	1	Europe	1
Russia	2	1	Europe	71
Singapore	2	1	Asia	23
Austria	1	0.5	Europe	14
Finland	1	0.5	Europe	12
Greece	1	0.5	Europe	25
Italy	1	0.5	Europe	18
Malaysia	1	0.5	Asia	66
Mexico	1	0.5	Americas	53
South Africa	1	0.5	Africa	129
Spain	1	0.5	Europe	15
Taiwan	1	0.5	Asia	na
Thailand	1	0.5	Asia	87
Total	200	100		

Source: UN Human Development Index are from, *Human Development Report 2009 – HDI rankings*. Retrieved on October 26, 2009 from: http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/; The University rankings data are compiled from, "Times Higher Education-QS World University Rankings 2009: Top 200 World Universities," *Times Higher Education Supplement* (UK). Retrieved on October 8, 2009 from: http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/Rankings2009-Top200.html.

Table 2
Regional and Sub-Regional Breakdown of the 2009 Times Higher Education-QS World University Top 200 Rankings, Number of institutions, percent of Region and World, Population, GDP and GDP per Capita (2008)

Region	University (N)	% of World	Population	GDP ($Billion)	Per Capita GDP
Asia	36	18	2,786,135,792	19,370.20	6,952
Europe	85	42.5	528,844,294	16,040	30,330
Oceania	12	6	25,180,770	919.5	36,516
Americas	66	33	446,992,736	17,310	38,725
Africa	1	0.5	48,782,756	492.2	10,100

Source: See Appendix B for "Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions,"; The University rankings data are compiled from (THE, 2009)
Populations total GDPs and GDP per capita are compiled and computed from the 2008 and 2009 *CIA World Factbook*: https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/

Breakdown of Institutions by Regions and Sub-Regions

Europe

Table 3 presents European nations with at least one university ranked in the 2009 *Times Higher Education*-QS top 200 universities and also the GDP and GDP Per Capita of each nation listed. Due to the large number of universities from the United Kingdom (29), the six nations of Northern Europe (61 million people) had the largest number of Universities (42), followed by the six nations of Western Europe (189 million people), with 38 universities. Northern Europe also had the highest GDP Per Capita $38,368, followed by Western Europe, $35,657. This GDP Per Capita gap could be a contributing factor as to why Northern Europe had the highest number of universities in the top 200 (Table 3).

Table 3
Regional and Sub-Regional Breakdown of the 2009 Times Higher Education-QS World University Top 200 Rankings, Number of institutions, percent of Region and World, Population, GDP and GDP per Capita: Europe

Region & SubRegion	University Number	% of SubRegion	% of Region	% of World	Population 2008 est.	GDP 2008 est. $Billion	GDP Per Capita 2008 est.
Europe	85		100	42.5	528,844,294	16,040	30,330
Northern Europe	42		49.4	21	89,787,380	3,445	38,368
United Kingdom	29	69	34.1	14.5	61,113,205	2,236	36,700
Sweden	5	11.9	5.9	2.5	9,059,651	345.1	38,200
Denmark	3	7.1	3.5	1.5	5,500,510	204.1	37,200
Ireland	2	4.8	2.3	1	4,203,200	189	45,500
Norway	2	4.8	2.3	1	4,660,539	276.3	59,500
Finland	1	2.4	1.2	0.5	5,250,275	194	37,000
Western Europe	38		44.7	19	189,332,633	6,751	35,657
Netherlands	11	28.9	12.9	5.5	16,715,999	673.5	40,500
Germany	10	26.3	11.8	5	82,329,758	2,925	35,500
Switzerland	6	15.8	7.1	3	7,604,467	318.1	42,000
Belgium	5	13.2	5.9	2.5	10,414,336	390.2	37,500
France	5	13.2	5.9	2.5	64,057,792	2,113	33,300
Austria	1	2.6	1.2	0.5	8,210,281	331.2	40,400
Southern Europe	3		3.5	1.5	109,388,642	3,572.80	32,661
Greece	1	33.3	1.2	0.5	10,737,428	343.8	32,100
Italy	1	33.3	1.2	0.5	58,126,212	1,827	31,400
Spain	1	33.3	1.2	0.5	40,525,002	1,402	34,600
Eastern Europe	2		2.3	1	140,041,247	2,271	16,100
Russia	2	100	2.3	1	140,041,247	2,271	16,100

Source: "Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions"; THE, 2009; 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook.

Americas

With only 3 nations (Canada, Mexico and the United States), the Americas represent the region with the second highest number of institutions, 66 (33% of the world) (Table 4). However, the United States and Canada (Northern America) accounted for all but one of those 66 ranked universities. Since geographically, the United States and Canada are very big nations, their data are broken down according to regions (United States) and provinces (Canada) (Table 4A) and also separated from Latin America and the Caribbean. For example, the State of California has almost as many institutions (9) ranked in the top 200 as Germany (10) (Table 4b). Mexico, grouped in Central America is the only other nation with one institution ranked (Table 4c). These three nations in all of the Americas with at least one university ranked in this study also comprise the North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).

Table 4

Sub-Regional Breakdown of the 2009 Times Higher Education-QS World University Top 200 Rankings, Number of institutions, percent of Region and World, Population, GDP and GDP per Capita: Northern America

Sub-Region	University Number	% of Region	% of World	Population 2008	GDP 2008 $Billion	GDP Per Capita $2008 est.
Northern America	65	98.5	32.5	337,037,336	15,743	46,710
LAC	1	1.5	0.5	109,995,400	1,567	14,300
Total	66	100	33	447,032,730	17,310	

Source: 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook; The Population figures for Canadian provinces and territories are extracted from "Table 2. Quarterly demographics estimates: July 1, 2008," Statistics Canada. Retrieved on October 31, 2009. http://www.statean.gc.ca./daily-uotidien/081219/t081219b2-eng.htm; The Canadian GDP and GDP per capita figures are in Canadian dollars. The Canadian GDP figures were extracted from: "Gross domestic product, expenditure-based, by province and territory: 2008," Statistics Canada. Retrieved on October 31, 2009 from: http:///www40.statcan.gc/101/cst01/cst01/econ15-eng.htm. I then divided the total GDP of each Canadian Province by its total population to get the GDP per capita; The GDP and GDP per capita figures for the U.S. states are from: "Economic Slowdown Widespread Among States in 2008," 2009, June 2. Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce; The Population figures for the U.S. states are extracted from "State Rankings -- Statistical Abstract of the United States: Resident Population -- July 2008. Retrieved on October 31, 2009 from: http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/ranks/rank01.xls; THE, 2009.

Table 4A

Canada (and its Provinces) Breakdown of the 2009 Times Higher Education-QS World University Top 200 Rankings, Number of institutions, percent of Region and World, Population, GDP and GDP per Capita: Northern America

	University Number	% of SubRegion	% of Region	% of World	Population 2008	GDP 2008 $Billion	GDP Per Capita $2008 est.
Canada	11	19.9	16.7	5.5	33,212,696	1,303	39,200
Newfoundland & Labrador					507,895	31.458	61,938
Prince Edward Island					139,818	4.716	33,730
Nova Scotia					938,310	34.209	36,458
New Brunswick					747,302	27.288	36,515
Quebec (18.2% of 11total)	2	3.1	3	1	7,750,504	301.479	38,898
Ontario (45.4%)	5	7.7	7.6	2.5	12,928,996	587.905	45,472
Manitoba					1,207,959	50.886	42,126
Saskatchewan					1,015,985	64.323	63,311
Alberta (18.2%)	2	3.1	3	1	3,585,142	291.662	81,353
British Columbia (18.2%)	2	3.1	3	1	4,381,603	199.214	45,466
Yukon					33,144	2.000	60,343
Northwest Territories					43,283	5.419	125,199
Nunavut					31,448	1.497	47,602

Source: 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook; THE, 2009. GDP and GDP per capita figures for the provinces are in Canadian dollars.

Table 4B

United States (and its 50 States and Washington, D.C.) Breakdown of the 2009 Times Higher Education-QS World University Top 200 Rankings, Number of institutions, percent of Region and World, Population, GDP and GDP per Capita: Northern America

	University Number	% of SubRegion	% of Region	% of World	Population 2008	GDP2008 $Billion	GDP Per Capita $2008 est.
United States	54	83.1	81.8	27	303,824,640	14,440	47,500
Northeast (33.3% of 54)	18	27.7	27.3	9			
New York (9.2% of 54)	5	7.7	7.6	2.5	19,490,297	964.755	49,499
Massachusetts (7.4%)	4	6.1	6.1	2	6,497,967	312.476	48,088
Pennsylvania (7.4%)	4	6.1	6.1	2	12,448,279	443.669	35,641
New Jersey (3.7%)	2	3.1	3	1	8,682,661	390.350	44,957
Connecticut (1.8%)	1	1.5	1.5	0.5	3,501,252	177.717	50,758
New Hampshire (1.8%)	1	1.5	1.5	0.5	1,315,809	50.553	38,420
Rhode Island (1.8%)	1	1.5	1.5	0.5	1,050,788	38.126	36,283
West (22.2%)	12	18.5	18.2	6			
California (16.7%)	9	13.8	13.6	4.5	36,756,666	1,546.25	42,064
Arizona (1.8%)	1	1.5	1.5	0.5	6,500,180	210.235	32,343
Colorado (1.8%)	1	1.5	1.5	0.5	4,939,456	203.024	41,102
Washington (1.8%)	1	1.5	1.5	0.5	6,549,224	264.633	40,407
Midwest (22.2%)	12	18.5	18.2	6			
Illinois (5.5%)	3	4.6	4.5	1.5	12,901,563	516.144	40,006
Indiana (5.5%)	3	4.6	4.5	1.5	6,376,792	209.903	32,917
Ohio (3.7%)	2	3.1	3	1	11,485,910	385.559	33,568
Michigan (1.8%)	1	1.5	1.5	0.5	10,003,422	326.123	32,601
Minnesota (1.8%)	1	1.5	1.5	0.5	5,220,393	217.028	41,573
Missouri (1.8%)	1	1.5	1.5	0.5	5,911,605	193.775	32,779
Wisconsin (1.8%)	1	1.5	1.5	0.5	5,627,967	198.324	35,239
South (22.2%)	12	18.5	18.2	6			
Texas (5.5%)	3	4.6	4.5	1.5	24,326,974	925.505	38,044
Georgia (3.7%)	2	3.1	3	1	9,685,744	329.482	34,017
Maryland (3.7%)	2	3.1	3	1	5,633,597	220.865	39,205
North Carolina (3.7%)	2	3.1	3	1	9,222,414	329.418	35,719
Tennessee (1.8%)	1	1.5	1.5	0.5	6,214,888	210.216	33,825
Virginia (1.8%)	1	1.5	1.5	0.5	7,769,089	324.505	41,769
Washington, D.C. (1.8%)	1	1.5	1.5	0.5	591,833		126,407

Source: 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook; THE, 2009.

Table 4C
Sub-Regional Breakdown of the 2009 Times Higher Education-QS World University Top 200 Rankings, Number of institutions, percent of Region and World, Population, GDP and GDP per Capita: Latin America and the Caribbean

Sub-Region	University Number	% of Region	% of World	Population 2008	GDP 2008 $Billion	GDP Per Capita $2008 est.
Latin America & Caribbean	1	1.5	0.5	109,995,400	1.567	14,300
Central America	1	1.5	0.5	109,995,400	1,567	14,300
Mexico	1	1.5	0.5	109,995,400	1,567	14,300
South America	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caribbean	0	0	0	0	0	0

Source: 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook; THE, 2009.

Asia

Asia is the world region with the third highest number and proportion of institutions among the top 200 list, with 36 (18% of the world) in 10 nations. The total population of the 10 Asian nations on the list as of July 2009 was 2.814 billion (72.7% of 3.87 billion, but 41.4% of 6.79 world population) (Compiled and Computed Based on data in the 2009 CIA World Factbook). Their total population in July 2008 was 2.79 billion (72.7% of 3.84 billion, but 41.6% of 6.71 billion world total). Their total GDP as of 2008 was $19.370 trillion (35.8% of $54.132 trillion, but 27.6% of $70.14 trillion Gross World Products). Their average GDP per capita in 2008 was $6,952.

Table 5
Regional and Sub-Regional Breakdown of the 2009 Times Higher Education-QS World University Top 200 Rankings, Number of institutions, percent of Region and World, Population, GDP and GDP per Capita: Asia.

Region & SubRegion	University Number	% of SubRegion	% of Region	% of World	Population 2008	GDP 2008 est. $Billion	GDP Per Capita $2008 est.
Asia	36		100	18	2,786,135,792	19,370.00	6,952
Eastern Asia	27		75	13.5	1,535,651,934	14,691.00	9,567
Japan	11	40.7	30.5	5.5	127,288,416	4,340.00	34,100
China	6	22.2	16.7	3	1,330,044,544	7,992.00	6,000
Hong Kong	5	18.5	13.9	2.5	7,018,636	307.3	43,800
South Korea	4	14.8	11.1	2	48,379,392	1,338.00	27,700
Taiwan	1	3.7	2.8	0.5	22,920,946	713.7	31,100
South East Asia	4		11.1	2	95,375,595	1,171.80	12,286
Singapore	2	50	5.5	1	4,608,167	237.9	51,600
Malaysia	1	25	2.8	0.5	25,274,132	385.2	15,200
Thailand	1	25	2.8	0.5	65,493,296	548.7	8,400
South Asia	2		5.5	1	1,147,995,904	3,304.00	2,900
India	2	100	5.5	1	1,147,995,904	3,304.00	2,900
Western Asia	3		8.3	1.5	7,112,359	203.4	28,600
Israel	3	100	8.3	1.5	7,112,359	203.4	28,600
Central Asia	0		0	0	0		0

Source: "Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions,"; THE, 2009; 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook.

Of the four sub-regions of Asia, Eastern Asia has the highest number and proportion of institutions 27 (75% of region and 13.5% of world) in 5 nations. South Eastern Asia has the second most number of institutions, 4 (11.1% of region and 2% of world) in 3 nations: Singapore, 2 (50% of sub-region, 5.5% of region, and 1% of world); 1 each for Malaysia and Thailand (25%, 2.8%, and 0.5%). Western Asia is the sub-region with the third highest number of institutions, 3 (8.3% of region and 1.5% of world). All 3 institutions are in Israel (100% of sub-region, 8.3% of region and 1.5% of world). Finally, India is the only country with 2 institutions (5.5% of region, and 1% of world) representing South Asia (Table 5).

Oceania

Oceania is the world region with the fourth highest number of institutions among the top 200 list. Of the four sub-regions of Oceania, only one has all 12 institutions on the list (100% of region and 6% of world), representing 2 nations (Australia and New Zealand): Australia, 9 (75% of sub-region, 75% of region, and 4.5% of world); and New Zealand, 3 (25% of sub-region, 25% of region, and 1.5% of world) (Table 6).

Table 6
Education-QS World University Top 200 Rankings, Number of institutions, percent of Region and World, Population, GDP and GDP per Capita: Oceania

Region & SubRegion	University Number	% of SubRegion	% of Region	% of World	Population 2009	GDP 2008 est. $Billion	GDP Per Capita 2008 est.
Oceania	12		100	6	25,180,770	919.5	36,516
Australia & New Zealand	12	100	100	6	25,180,770	919.5	36,516
Australia	9	75	75	4.5	21,007,310	802.9	38,200
New Zealand	3	25	25	1.5	4,173,460	116.6	27,900
Melanesia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Micronesia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Polynesia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Source: "Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions,"; THE, 2009; 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook.

Africa

Finally, of the five sub-regions of Africa, only 1 (Southern Africa) has a country (South Africa) with an institution on the list (100% each of sub-region and region, and 0.5% of World). South Africa's total population as of July 2008 was 48.8 million. Its GDP in 2008 was $492.2 billion (0.9% of $54.132 trillion) (Table 7).

Table 7
Regional and Sub-Regional Breakdown of the 2009 Times Higher Education-QS World University Top 200 Rankings, Number of institutions, percent of Region and World, Population, GDP and GDP per Capita: Africa

Region & SubRegion	University Number	% of SubRegion	% of Region	% of World	Population 2008	GDP est.2008 $Billion	GDP Per Capita 2008 est.
Africa	1		100	0.5	48,782,756	492.2	10,100
Southern Africa	1		100	0.5	48,782,756	492.2	10,100
South Africa	1	100	100	0.5	48,782,756	492.2	10,100

Source: "Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions,"; THE, 2009; 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook.

Chinese Majority Entities/Nations

There are 14 institutions in the top 200 all located in 4 nations in Asia where Chinese comprise the majority (40% of Asia region and 7% of world): China, 6; Hong Kong, 5; Singapore, 2; and Taiwan, 1. Their total population as of July 2008 was 1.365 billion (48.9% of 2.79 billion Asia total, but 20.3% of 6.71 billion world population). Their total GDP as of 2008 was $9.251 trillion (17.1% of $54.132 trillion, but 13.2% of $70.14 trillion Gross World Products), and their GDP per capita in 2008 was $6,779 (Table 8).

Table 8
Breakdown of Chinese Majority Nations/Entities in the 2009 Times Higher Education-QS World University Top 200 Rankings, Number of institutions, percent of Region and World, Population, GDP and GDP per Capita

Region & SubRegion	University Number	% of Region	% of World	Population 2008	GDP est.2008 $Billion	GDP Per Capita $ 2008 est.
Chinese Majority Nations/Entities	14	40	7	1,364,592,293	9,250.90	6,779
China	6	17.1	3	1,330,044,544	7,992.00	6,000
Hong Kong	5	14.3	2.5	7,018,636	307.3	43,800
Singapore	2	5.7	1	4,608,167	237.9	51,600
Taiwan	1	2.9	0.5	22,920,946	713.7	31,100

Source: "Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions,"; THE, 2009; 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook.

European Union

Table 9 illustrates the wealth and influence of European Union nations, which are translated or exhibited in their combined relative large number of universities ranked in the top 200 of this study. Of the 16 European nations with institutions in the top 200 rankings, 13 (81%, but 40.6% of 32 nations on the list) are members of the 27-member European Union. These 13 nations have a total of 75 institutions ranked in the top 200 list (88.2% of 85 Europe total, and 37.5% of world total). Their total population as of July 2008 was 376 million (71.1% of the 528.9 million Europe total, but 5.6% of 6.71 billion world total). Their total GDP as of 2008 was $13.174 trillion (82.1% of $16.040 trillion Europe total, but 18.8% of $70.14 trillion Gross World Products), and their GDP per capita was $ 35,045 (Table 9).

Table 9
Breakdown of European Union Nations in the 2009 Times Higher Education-QS World University Top 200 Rankings, Number of institutions, percent of Region and World, Population, GDP and GDP per Capita

Region & SubRegion	University Number	% of Region	% of World	Population 2008	GDP 2008 est. $Billion	GDP Per Capita 2008 est.
European Union	75	87.1	37	375,916,221	13,173.90	35,045
United Kingdom	29	34.1	14.5	60,943,912	2,236	36,700
Netherlands	11	12.9	5.5	16,645,313	673.5	40,500
Germany	10	10.6	4.5	82,369,552	2,925	35,500
Belgium	5	5.9	2.5	10,403,951	390.2	37500
France	5	5.9	2.5	64,057,792	2,113	33,300
Sweden	5	5.9	2.5	9,045,389	345.1	38,200
Denmark	3	3.5	1.5	5,484,723	204.1	37,200
Ireland	2	2.3	1	4,156,119	189	45,500
Austria	1	1.2	0.5	8,205,533	331.2	40,400
Finland	1	1.2	0.5	5,244,749	194	37,000
Greece	1	1.2	0.5	10,722,816	343.8	32,100
Italy	1	1.2	0.5	58,145,320	1,827	31,400
Spain	1	1.2	0.5	40,491,052	1,402	34,600

Source: "Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions,"; THE, 2009; 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook.

Discussion

Just as there are many questions as to why in a world of at least 238 nations, territories or entities and 6.79 billion people in July 2009, only 32 nations representing 3.9 billion people had at least one institution ranked in the top 200 universities in this study, there are also many answers for this phenomenon. What are the factors responsible for this phenomenon? Does a nation's total population contribute to its chances of having one or more institutions ranked in the top 200 universities? Does the wealth of a nation such as GDP or GDP per capita, or the total endowment of an institution contribute to inclusion on the list? Does having a world-class faculty increases the chance of an institution being ranked in the top 200 of world universities? Does religion or religious denomination play a role? What about the number of years of existence of an institution, does it contribute to being among the top 200 universities? What about the year of independence of a nation or its colonial heritage? Or does colonial heritage contribute to being ranked in the top 200 of world universities? Finally, does language contribute, specifically, the language of instruction of a particular institution? (There is considerable evidence as we shall see later that suggest that yes, language, especially English is a major factor). In attempting to answer some of these questions, it will become apparent that issues such as power, geopolitics and hegemony of some countries, especially the United Kingdom and the United States, will directly impact the positioning of a number of some universities in these rankings. Also, it is very important to take into account national inequalities. Naturally in the rankings there are countries such as the United States and the United Kingdom that have in the rankings a very large number of universities, in comparison to other countries. However, these universities are not representative of the countries quantitatively, both higher education systems are complex, diversified and most of the higher education student

population never have and will attend these types of institutions. With these notes of caution in mind, let me attempt to answer some of these questions.

Population

One would expect that the larger a nation's population, the more colleges and universities it is likely to have listed in the 2009 *Times Higher Education*-QS top 200 universities. That is not the case, however. Many other factors are at play. Quality of the education provided is a very important factor. Sweitzer and Volkwein (2009) point out that the prestige of a university, which is linked to quality, is an important factor that determines whether an institution is ranked in world rankings studies. As a result, smaller countries with substantial amount of research funding, distinguished faculty and highly selected students, could be in a better position to have their universities ranked, while very populous nations without universities with such characteristics, are not likely to be ranked in world rankings.

According to Table 10 below, while to a great extent that could be the case for some nations, such as Japan and the United States, it is not the case for many others. On the other hand, according to Table 10, there are nations with relatively small populations, but have more institutions ranked in the top 200 than larger nations. For example, according to Table 10, the United States and Japan have 2009 populations of 307 million (4.6% of the world) and 127 million (1.9%), but have 27% and 5.5% of institutions among the top 200 respectively. India and China have populations of 1.17 billion (17.2% of world) and 1.34 billion (20% of world), but have 1% and 3% of institutions among the top 200 respectively. The United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, the Netherlands, Belgium, Hong Kong, Sweden Denmark, Israel, New Zealand, Ireland, Norway and Singapore have populations of 61.1 million (0.9% of world), 21.3 million (0.3%), 33.5 million (0.5%), 17.7 million (0.2%), 10.4 million (0.15%), 7 million (0.1%), 9 million (0.13%), 5.5 million (0.08%), 7.2 million (0.1%), 4.2 million (0.06%), 4.2 million (0.06%), 4.7 million (0.07%), and 4.7 million (0.07%) respectively. Yet they had the following proportions of institutions ranked: 14.5%; 4.5%; 5.5%; 5.5%; 2.5%; 2.5%; 2.5%; 1.5%; 1.5%; 1.5%; 1%; and 1% respectively (Table 10).

Table 10
32 nations With at Least One Institution Ranked in the 2009 Times Higher Education-QS World University Top 200, Population in 2009 and Percent of World, and Education Expenditure

Nation	Number of Institutions	%	Population 2009 est.	% of World	Education Expenditure as % of GDP 2005
United States	54	27	307,212,123	4.6	5.3
United Kingdom	29	15	61,113,205	0.9	5.6
Canada	11	5.5	33,487,208	0.5	5.2 (2002)
Japan	11	5.5	127,078,679	1.9	3.5
Netherlands	11	5.5	16,715,999	0.2	5.3
Germany	10	5	82,329,758	1.2	4.6 (2004)
Australia	9	4.5	21,262,641	0.3	4.5
China	6	3	1,338,612,968	20	1.9 (1999)
Switzerland	6	3	7,604,467	0.11	5.8
Belgium	5	2.5	10,414,336	0.15	6 (2004)
France	5	2.5	64,057,792	0.94	5.7
Hong Kong	5	2.5	7,055,071	0.1	3.9 (2006)
Sweden	5	2.5	9,059,651	0.13	7.1
South Korea	4	2	48,508,972	0.7	4.6 (2004)
Denmark	3	1.5	5,500,510	0.08	8.3
Israel	3	1.5	7,233,701	0.1	6.9 (2004)
New Zealand	3	1.5	4,213,418	0.06	6.2 (2006)
India	2	1	1,166,079,217	17.2	3.2
Ireland	2	1	4,203,200	0.06	4.7
Norway	2	1	4,660,539	0.07	7.2
Russia	2	1	140,041,247	2.1	3.8
Singapore	2	1	4,657,542	0.07	3.7 (2001)
Austria	1	0.5	8,210,281	0.12	5.4
Finland	1	0.5	5,250,275	0.08	6.4
Greece	1	0.5	10,737,428	0.16	4.4
Italy	1	0.5	58,126,212	0.86	4.5
Malaysia	1	0.5	25,715,819	0.38	6.2 (2004)
Mexico	1	0.5	111,211,789	1.6	5.5
South Africa	1	0.5	49,052,489	0.7	5.4 (2006)
Spain	1	0.5	40,525,002	0.6	4.2
Taiwan	1	0.5	22,974,347	0.34	..
Thailand	1	0.5	65,905,410	0.97	4.2

Source: THE, 2009; 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook.

Gross Domestic Products and Per Capita Gross Domestic Products

Marginson (2007) presents data showing the link or correlation between GDP of nations and the positions of their colleges and universities in a top 100 world university rankings (p. 15-16). One might argue that the larger the amount of a nation's gross domestic products (GDP) or GDP per capita, the more likely it could be in the position to have at least one college or university ranked in

the top 200. In fact, I found that in 2008, of the 14 nations in the world with a GDP of at least $1 trillion (6 in Europe, including Russia; 4 in Asia; and 4 in the Americas), only Brazil, with a population of 198.7 million in July 2009 (with GDP in 2008 of $1.998 trillion) did not have at least one institution ranked in the top 200. The logic is that nations with very high GDP and GDP per capita are in the position to strategically invest in certain universities and put them in the position to be ranked.

It has been noted that the colonization process of a nation in the New World could lead to such nation's universities not to be in a position to be ranked in the top 200 universities. Brazil is an example of such a nation. The Portuguese are said not to have had any specific interest in investing or building prominent universities, when compared to the Spaniards in Mexico, for example. As a result, the earliest Brazilian universities were established after independence in the early 1900s (Rezende, 2010; Franco & Morosini, 1992, p. 70). This leads to the debate as to whether it is governments in countries or the universities in those countries that are responsible to do what it takes to be ranked in the top 200. One cannot rush to claim that financing does not matter but even when a country may invest a lot of money in its universities this cannot guarantee it to automatically place a university in the top 200 rankings.

The example presented above by Cantwell and Maldonado-Maldonado (2009, p. 296-297) of wealthy Arab and Islamic countries acknowledging the lack of universities from their countries in the top 200 and their goal of strategically investing huge sums of money in their universities to help them enter the top 200 illustrates that money does not always assure top ranking status. But one could also argue that money may have contributed to those universities that are ranked in the top 200.

So, there may be nations with very large GDP but with only a few institutions ranked in the top 200. Russia, Italy and Spain, for example, have 2008 GDP of $2.271 trillion, $1.823 trillion, and $1.403 trillion respectively, but they have only 2, 1 and 1 institutions ranked respectively in the top 200. Thailand has a 2008 GDP per capita of $8,400, and a population of 66 million in July 2009, but has at least 1 institution ranked in the top 200. In addition to large amounts of GDP and GDP per capita, a visible effort to invest in higher education might be what it takes to be in the position to be ranked in the top 200. This has been the problem that India (with over 1 billion people) is experiencing. Writing about India's economic progress, but its lack of serious investment in its higher education institutions, Altbach (2006) notes that decades ago India decided to utilize a policy of first investing relatively very little funding in education, and then "…spread its money widely, devoting only 0.37 percent of its gross domestic product (GDP) to post secondary education…". Even with its rising economy and the rapid pace of progress in higher education in Asia and elsewhere, India continues to invest little in higher education. The result is that India is not reaching its potential and that: "The absence of a significant group of world-class universities is perhaps the most serious impediment to India's ambition to build a sophisticated knowledge-based economy…" (p. 49-50; also see Altbach, 2005).

One could argue that a real commitment by a nation to invest a substantial amount of money into its education sector is a very good start to be in a position to have recognized universities. Table 10 presents education expenditure as percent of GDP for 31 of the 32 nations. Table 10 shows that most of these countries do make the effort to invest substantial amount of their GDP into their education sectors. The data is for the year 2005 for 20 of the 31 nations (excluding Taiwan) and for the remaining 11 nations, the years range from 1999 to 2006. According to Table 10, in 2005, the education expenditure for these nations ranged from a low of 1.9% in China to a high of 8.3% in Denmark (Table 10).

Total Exports and Imports of Goods and Services

The ability of people in a particular nation to convince people around the world to buy their products and services is in many ways connected to the productivity of colleges and universities in that nation. That is because it is the colleges and university that contribute to train the workforce that is able to produce such goods and services. Today, nations that export or import tens of billions of dollars or hundreds of billions of dollars or a trillion dollars or more tend to be highly respected in international relations, belonging to exclusive economic organizations of nations. One can then argue that the 2008 data on trade (exports and imports) of the 32 nations with institutions among the top 200 universities may help us understand why these nations were able to have at least one institution ranked.

Table 11 below examines the trade figures (exports and imports) of all 32 nations on the top 200 list for the year 2008. The table presents total exports and per capita exports and total imports and per capita imports, utilizing the 2008 population figures of those nations. For exports, according to Table 11, their combined population in 2008 was 3.84 billion (57.2% of 6.71 billion people in 2008) and their combined exports in 2008 was $12.446 trillion (77.6% of $16.040 total world exports). Their per capita export was $3,245 ($12.446 divided by 3.84 billion people in those nations in 2008). Their combined import in 2008 was $12.717 trillion (79.6% of $15.970 trillion total world imports) and their per capita import in 2008 was $3,315 ($12.717 divided by 3.84 billion people in the world).

Tables 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 below examine trade figures for 2008 for the following regions: Europe, Americas, Asia, Oceania and Africa, respectively. The combined exports for Europe in 2008 was $5.914 trillion (47.5% of $12.446 trillion of 32 nations, but 36.9% of $16.040 world total exports) and their per capita exports was $11,183; For the Americas, $2.027 trillion ($16.3% and 12.6% respectively) and per capita exports of $4,535. For Asia, $4.197 trillion (33.7% and 26.2% respectively) and per capita exports of $1,506. For Oceania, $222 billion (1.8% and 1.4% respectively) and per capita exports of $8,780; and Africa (South Africa), $86.12 (0.7% and 0.5% respectively) and per capita exports of $1,765.

For imports figures, the 16 European nations on the list had a combined import in 2008 of $5.723 trillion (45% of $12.717 trillion and 35.8% of $15.970 world total) and per capita import of $10,822. For the Americas, $2.841 trillion (22.3% of $12.717 trillion and 17.8% of $15.970 world total) and per capita import of $6,356. For Asia, $3.836 trillion (30.1% of $12.717 trillion and 24% of $15.970 trillion world total) and per capita import of $1,377. For Oceania, $227 billion (1.8% of $12.717 and 1.4% of $15.970 trillion world total) and per capita imports of $9,013. For Africa (South Africa), $90.57 billion (0.7% of $12.717 trillion and 0.6% of $15.970 world total) and per capita imports of $1,857 (Tables 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16).

Table 11

Total Exports and Imports and Rank of Goods and Services of 32 Nations With at Least One Institution Ranked in the 2009 Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 World Universities, and Population in 2008

Nation	# of Institutions	%	Population 2008 est.	Exports 2008 est. $Billion	Per Capita $$	Rank	Imports 2008 est. $Billion	Per Capita $	Rank
USA	54	27	303,824,640	1,277	4,203	25	2,117	6,968	24
UK	29	15	60,943,912	466.3	7,651	21	639.3	10,490	15
Canada	11	5.5	33,212,696	459.1	13,823	13	415.2	12,501	13
Japan	11	5.5	127,288,416	746.5	5,865	24	708.3	5,564	26
Netherlands	11	5.5	16,645,313	531.7	31,943	5	474.8	28,524	5
Germany	10	5	82,369,552	1,498	18,186	12	1,232	14,957	12
Australia	9	4.5	21,007,310	189.9	9,040	17	194.2	9,244	19
China	6	3	1,330,044,544	1,435	1,079	31	1,074	807	31
Switzerland	6	3	7,581,520	241.3	31,827	6	227.4	29,994	4
Belgium	5	2.5	10,403,951	371.5	35,708	4	387.7	37,265	3
France	5	2.5	64,057,792	601.9	9,396	16	692	10,803	14
Hong Kong	5	2.5	7,018,636	365.2	52,033	2	388.4	55,338	2
Sweden	5	2.5	9,045,389	185.9	20,552	10	167.8	18,551	9
South Korea	4	2	48,379,392	433.5	8,960	18	427.4	8,834	21
Denmark	3	1.5	5,484,723	114.9	20,949	9	116.4	21,223	7
Israel	3	1.5	7,112,359	57.16	8,037	19	64.4	9,055	20
New Zealand	3	1.5	4,173,460	31.19	7,473	22	32.76	7,850	23
India	2	1	1,147,995,904	187.9	164	32	315.1	275	32
Ireland	2	1	4,156,119	119.8	28,825	7	84.82	20,408	8
Norway	2	1	4,644,457	173.6	37,378	3	85.95	18,506	10
Russia	2	1	140,702,096	471.6	3,352	26	291.9	2,075	29
Singapore	2	1	4,608,167	342.7	74,368	1	309.6	67,185	1
Austria	1	0.5	8,205,533	179.1	21,827	8	179.2	21,839	6
Finland	1	0.5	5,244,749	96.62	18,422	11	87.51	16,685	11
Greece	1	0.5	10,722,816	29.14	2,718	27	93.91	8,758	22
Italy	1	0.5	58,145,320	546.9	9,406	15	546.9	9,406	18
Malaysia	1	0.5	25,274,132	198.7	7,862	20	154.7	6,121	25
Mexico	1	0.5	109,955,400	291.3	2,649	29	308.6	2,807	27
South Africa	1	0.5	48,782,756	86.12	1,765	30	90.57	1,857	30
Spain	1	0.5	40,491,052	285.9	7,061	23	415.5	10,261	17
Taiwan	1	0.5	22,920,946	254.9	11,121	14	236.7	10,327	16
Thailand	1	0.5	65,493,296	175.3	2,677	28	157.3	2,402	28
Total/Ave.	200	100	3,835,936,348	12,446	3,245		12,717	3,315	
World	200	100	6,706,993,152	16,040			15,970		

Source: THE, 2009; 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook.

Table 12

Total Exports and Imports and Rank of Goods and Services of European Nations With at Least One Institution Ranked in the 2009 Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 World Universities, and Population in 2008

Nation	# of Institutions	%	Population 2008 est.	Exports 2008 est. $Billion	Per Capita $	Rank	Imports 2008 est. $Billion	Per Capita $	Rank
UK	29	15	60,943,912	466.3	7,651	21	639.3	10,490	15
Netherlands	11	5.5	16,645,313	531.7	31,943	5	474.8	28,524	5
Germany	10	5	82,369,552	1,498	18,186	12	1,232	14,957	12
Switzerland	6	3	7,581,520	241.3	31,827	6	227.4	29,994	4
Belgium	5	2.5	10,403,951	371.5	35,708	4	387.7	37,265	3
France	5	2.5	64,057,792	601.9	9,396	16	692	10,803	14
Sweden	5	2.5	9,045,389	185.9	20,552	10	167.8	18,551	9
Denmark	3	1.5	5,484,723	114.9	20,949	9	116.4	21,223	6
Ireland	2	1	4,156,119	119.8	28,825	7	84.82	20,408	8
Norway	2	1	4,644,457	173.6	37,378	3	85.95	18,506	10
Russia	2	1	140,702,096	471.6	3,352	26	291.9	2,075	29
Austria	1	0.5	8,205,533	179.1	21,827	8	179.2	21,839	6
Finland	1	0.5	5,244,749	96.62	18,422	11	87.51	16,685	11
Greece	1	0.5	10,722,816	29.14	2,718	27	93.91	8,758	22
Italy	1	0.5	58,145,320	546.9	9,406	15	546.9	9,406	18
Spain	1	0.5	40,491,052	285.9	7,061	23	415.5	10,261	17
Total/Ave.	85	43	528,844,294	5,914.16	11,183		5,723.09	10,822	

Source: THE, 2009; 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook.

Table 13

Total Exports and Imports and Rank of Goods and Services of Nations in the Americas With at Least One Institution Ranked in the 2009 Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 World Universities, and Population in 2008

Nation	# of Institutions	%	Population 2008 est.	Exports 2008 est. $Billion	Per Capita $	Rank	Imports 2008 est. $Billion	Per Capita $	Rank
USA	54	27	303,824,640	1,277	4,203	25	2,117	6,968	24
Canada	11	5.5	33,212,696	459.1	13,823	13	415.2	12,501	13
Mexico	1	0.5	109,955,400	291.3	2,649	29	308.6	2,807	27
Total/Ave.	66	33	446,992,736	2,027	4,535		2,841	6,356	

Source: THE, 2009; 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook.

Table 14

Total Exports and Imports and Rank of Goods and Services of Asian Nations With at Least One Institution Ranked in the 2009 Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 World Universities, and Population in 2008

Nation	# of Institutions	%	Population 2008 est.	Exports 2008 est. $Billion	Per Capita $	Rank	Imports 2008 est. $Billion	Per Capita $	Rank
Japan	11	5.5	127,288,416	746.5	5,865	24	708.3	5,564	26
China	6	3	1,330,044,544	1,435	1,079	31	1,074	807	31
Hong Kong	5	2.5	7,018,636	365.2	52,033	2	388.4	55,338	2
South Korea	4	2	48,379,392	433.5	8,960	18	427.4	8,834	21
Israel	3	1.5	7,112,359	57.16	8,037	19	64.4	9,055	20
India	2	1	1,147,995,904	187.9	164	32	315.1	275	32
Singapore	2	1	4,608,167	342.7	74,368	1	309.6	67,185	1
Malaysia	1	0.5	25,274,132	198.7	7,862	20	154.7	6,121	25
Taiwan	1	0.5	22,920,946	254.9	11,121	14	236.7	10,327	16
Thailand	1	0.5	65,493,296	175.3	2,677	28	157.3	2,402	28
Total/Ave.	36	18	2,786,135,792	4,196.86	1,506		3,835.90	1,377	

Source: THE, 2009; 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook.

Table 15

Total Exports and Imports and Rank of Goods and Services of Oceania Nations With at Least One Institution Ranked in the 2009 Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 World Universities, and Population in 2008

Nation	# of Institutions	%	Population 2008 est.	Exports 2008 est. $Billion	Per Capita $	Rank	Imports 2008 est. $Billion	Per Capita $	Rank
Australia	9	4.5	21,007,310	189.9	9,040	17	194.2	9,244	19
New Zealand	3	1.5	4,173,460	31.19	7,473	22	32.76	7,850	23
Total/Ave.	12	6	25,180,770	221.09	8,780		226.96	9,013	

Source: THE, 2009; 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook.

Table 16

Total Exports and Imports and Rank of Goods and Services of African Nations With at Least One Institution Ranked in the 2009 Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 World Universities, and Population in 2008

Nation	# of Institutions	%	Population 2008 est.	Exports 2008 est. $Billion	Per Capita $	Rank	Imports 2008 est. $Billion	Per Capita $	Rank
South Africa	1	0.5	48,782,756	86.12	1,765	30	90.57	1,857	30
Total/Ave.	1	0.5	48,782,756	86.12	1,765		90.57	1,857	

Source: THE, 2009; 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook.

Tables 17, 18, and 19 examine 2008 trade (exports and imports) figures for the Chinese Majority Nations, European Union and NAFTA nations on the list. For the four Chinese Majority Nations, their combined exports in 2008 were $2.398 trillion (19.3% of $12.446 trillion and 14.9% of $16.040 trillion) and their per capita exports were $1,757. Their combined imports in 2008 were $2,009 trillion (15.8% or $12.717 trillion and 12.6% of $15.970 trillion world total).

For the 13 European Union nations, their combined exports in 2008 were $5.028 trillion (40.4% of $12.446 trillion and 31.3% of $16.040 trillion world total) and their per capita exports were $13,374. Their combined imports were $5.118 trillion (40.7% of $12.717 trillion and 32% of $15.970 trillion world total) and their per capita import was $13,614.

Table 17

Total Exports and Imports and Rank of Goods and Services of Chinese Majority Nations With at Least One Institution Ranked in the 2009 Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 World Universities, and Population in 2008

Nation	# of Institutions	%	Population 2008 est.	Exports 2008 est. $Billion	Per Capita $	Rank	Imports 2008 est. $Billion	Per Capita $	Rank
China	6	3	1,330,044,544	1,435	1,079	31	1,074	807	31
Hong Kong	5	2.5	7,018,636	365.2	52,033	2	388.4	55,338	2
Singapore	2	1	4,608,167	342.7	74,368	1	309.6	67,185	1
Taiwan	1	0.5	22,920,946	254.9	11,121	14	236.7	10,327	16

Source: THE, 2009; 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook.

Table 18

Total Exports and Imports and Rank of Goods and Services of European Union Nations With at Least One Institution Ranked in the 2009 Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 World Universities, and Population in 2008

Nation	# of Institutions	%	Population 2008 est.	Exports 2008 est. $Billion	Per Capita $	Rank	Imports 2008 est. $Billion	Per Capita $	Rank
UK	29	15	60,943,912	466.3	7,651	21	639.3	10,490	15
Netherlands	11	5.5	16,645,313	531.7	31,943	5	474.8	28,524	5
Germany	10	5	82,369,552	1,498	18,186	12	1,232	14,957	12
Belgium	5	2.5	10,403,951	371.5	35,708	4	387.7	37,265	3
France	5	2.5	64,057,792	601.9	9,396	16	692	10,803	14
Sweden	5	2.5	9,045,389	185.9	20,552	10	167.8	18,551	9
Denmark	3	1.5	5,484,723	114.9	20,949	9	116.4	21,223	7
Ireland	2	1	4,156,119	119.8	28,825	7	84.82	20,408	8
Austria	1	0.5	8,205,533	179.1	21,827	8	179.2	21,839	6
Finland	1	0.5	5,244,749	96.62	18,422	11	87.51	16,685	11
Greece	1	0.5	10,722,816	29.14	2,718	27	93.91	8,758	22
Italy	1	0.5	58,145,320	546.9	9,406	15	546.9	9,406	18
Spain	1	0.5	40,491,052	285.9	7,061	23	415.5	10,261	17
Total/Ave.	75	38	375,916,221	5,027.66	13,374		5,117.84	13,614	

Source: THE, 2009; 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook.

For the three NAFTA nations, their combined exports in 2008 were $2.027 trillion ($16.3% $12.446 trillion and 12.6% of $16.040 trillion world total) and per capita exports of $4,535. Their combined imports in 2008 were $2.841 trillion (22.3% of $12.717 trillion and 17.8% of $15.970 world total) and per capita imports of $6,356 (Tables 17, 18, and 19).

Table 19
Total Exports and Imports and Rank of Goods and Services of NAFTA Nations With at Least One Institution Ranked in the 2009 Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 World Universities, and Population in 2008

Nation	# of Institutions	%	Population 2008 est.	Exports 2008 est. $Billion	Per Capita $	Rank	Imports 2008 est. $Billion	Per Capita $	Rank
United States	54	27	303,824,640	1,277	4,203	25	2,117	6,968	24
Canada	11	5.5	33,212,696	459.1	13,823	13	415.2	12,501	13
Mexico	1	0.5	109,955,400	291.3	2,649	29	308.6	2,807	27
Total/Ave	66	33	446,992,736	2,027	4,535		2,841	6,356	

Source: THE, 2009; 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook.

The significance of Tables 12 to 19 is to show that the high levels of international trade of these nations, regions and entities are directly connected to their universities ranked in the top 200 of this study. These universities in these nations contributed to those businesses that were involved in trade, just as those businesses might have contributed to those universities being ranked in the top 200. The universities educate or train the workforce of those businesses in those nations, while those businesses invest in those universities in many different ways, including research for professors and scholars, and scholarships for students. It is highly unlikely that these nations would have exported and imported such massive amounts of goods and services without the contributions of their ranked universities.

Endowment of an Institution

An institution's endowment plays a crucial role in its chances to become recognized as a top rated or world-class entity. For example, according to Wangenge-Ouma and Langa (2010), "Financial resources are arguably the most important for the 'survival' of universities" (p.750). Institutions with large endowments may be recognized as top rated because relative to other institutions with inadequate endowments, parents, family members and students know that their Astronomy, biology, chemistry and physics laboratories, for example, have the most modern and sophisticated equipments or tools. The faculty members of these institutions also have the available research funding to focus on their projects and teaching (Poh, 2010, p. 71-72; also see Hawthorne, 2007).

Table 20 tends to imply that the larger the financial amount of an institution's endowment, the more likely that not only will it be ranked among the top 200 universities, but also ranked higher. Table 20 utilizes endowment figures for 2007 provided by the U.S. Department of Education for 52 of the 54 U.S. institutions ranked among the top 200 universities (data were not available for State University of New York, Stony Brook and the University of Arizona). For the public institutions of California, 6 of them are on the list, but direct endowment figures were provided for University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) ($975,295,000), and University of California, Berkeley ($837,011,000), but another figure of $6,439,436,000 was provided under the name University of California System, which may include the remaining institutions on the list: University of California, San Diego, University of California, Santa Barbara, University of California, Davis, and University of California, Irvine. The same is done with the University of Texas, Austin. The figure provided ($15,613,672,000) says University of Texas System, with University of Texas, Austin, the highest ranked of them all. The same was done for Texas A&M University, whereby the figure provided

($6,590,300,000) says Texas A&M System, with Texas A&M University being the highest ranked of them all.

The endowment data provided by the U.S. Department of Education were for the 120 institutions in the U.S. with the highest endowments. The total endowment of all 120 institutions in 2007 was $322.2 billion. The total endowment of the 52 of 54 U.S. institutions ranked in the top 200 *Times Higher Education*-QS study was $254 billion (78.8%). According to Table 20, six institutions or University systems have endowments of $10 billion or more in 2007: Harvard ($34.6 billion); Yale ($22.5 billion); Stanford ($17.2 billion); Princeton ($15.8 billion); University of Texas System ($15.6 billion); and Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) ($10 billion) (Table 20 ; see Barrows, 2009).

It is useful to note that two of the highest ranked and most prestigious institutions in the United Kingdom also have substantial amount of endowments. For example, it is noted on November 27, 2006 that: "The total figure for 'Cambridge' [Endowment] is currently around …4.1 billion, [British Pounds]…"[5] According to the frequently asked questions section of its website, the University of Oxford reports that in 2007, its total endowments was around 3.4 billion British Pounds.[6] It is useful to point out that the age of an institution could be linked to its ability to have relatively large endowment.[7]

It is important to note that the establishment of university endowments can be common in some nations but not in others. For example, this is a phenomenon that is more common in the United Kingdom and the United States primarily due to the historical ties of these two nations.

---

[5] "University of Cambridge appoints Nick Cavalla of Man Global Strategies as Chief Investment Officer," University of Cambridge News. Retrieved on November 27, 2009 from:http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/news/press/dpp/2006112701.

[6] "FAQ," Oxford Thinking: The Campaign for the University of Oxford. University of Oxford. Retrieved on November 29,2009 from::://www.campaign.ox.ac.uk/campaign/the_campaign/faq.html.

[7] One could attempt to make an argument that the age of an institution might contribute to it being ranked in the top 200. That is because such an institution may have accumulated large financial endowments and may also have invested highly in recruiting talented professors or scholars, staff and students. Also, a system might have been established where older or senior scholars would mentor younger scholars throughout generations or centuries, thereby leading to a smooth transfer of ideas. However, there might be institutions that are relatively new but because of determination by a country or society the people in that society would do all they can to invest in those institutions. For example, on the institutions' websites, the following institutions ranked in the top 200 have the following years of establishment: University of Oxford (1096); University of Cambridge (1209); Harvard University (1636); Yale University (1701); Princeton University (1746). However, one can also find institutions ranked among the top 200 that were established after World War II: University of Malaya (1949); Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi (1961); and the Hong Kong University of Science & Technology (1991).

Table 20

List of U.S. institutions ranked in Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 Universities in the World in 2009, U.S. News and World Report College Rankings for the U.S. Institutions on the List, 2010, their 2007 Endowments and rank of Endowments

2009 Rank	2010 *U.S. News* Rank	Institution	Endowment 2007 US $	Rank
1	1	Harvard University	34,634,906,000	1
3	3	Yale University	22,530,200,000	2
7	8	University of Chicago	6,204,189,000	13
8	1	Princeton University	15,787,200,000	4
9	4	MIT	9,980,410,000	6
10	4	California Institute of Technology	1,860,052,000	34
11	8	Columbia University	7,149,803,000	7
12	4	University of Pennsylvania	6,635,187,000	9
13	14	Johns Hopkins University	2,800,377,000	25
14	10	Duke University	5,910,280,000	15
15	15	Cornell University	5,424,733,000	18
16	4	Stanford University	17,164,836,000	3
19	27	University of Michigan	7,089,830,000	8
27	22	Carnegie Mellon University	1,115,740,000	64
31	16	Brown University	2,780,798,000	26
32	24	University of California, Los Angeles	975,295,000	78
32	12	Northwestern University	6,503,292,000	11
39	21	University of California, Berkeley	837,011,000	86
52	32	New York University	2,161,800,000	31
54	56	Boston University	1,101,386,000	68
61	39	University of Wisconsin-Madison	1,645,250,000	44
63	39	University of Illinois (UC)	1,515,387,000	47
73	12	Washington University in St Louis	5,567,843,000	16
76	35	University of California, San Diego*	..	..
76	47	University of Texas at Austin**	..	..
78	28	University of North Carolina (CH)	2,164,444,000	30
80	42	University of Washington	2,184,374,000	29
85	11	Dartmouth College	3,760,234,000	21
86	35	Georgia Institute of Technology	1,281,162,000	54

Table 20 (continued)
List of U.S. institutions ranked in Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 Universities in the World in 2009, U.S. News and World Report College Rankings for the U.S. Institutions on the List, 2010, their 2007 Endowments and rank of Endowments

2009 Rank	2010 *U.S. News* Rank	Institution	Endowment 2007 US $	Rank
87	61	Purdue University	1,786,592,000	36
90	17	Emory University	5,561,743,000	17
100	17	Rice University	4,669,544,000	19
105	61	University of Minnesota	2,804,466,000	24
106	42	University of California, SB*	..	..
108	42	University of California, Davis*	..	..
112	26	University of Southern California	3,715,272,000	22
114	56	University of Pittsburgh	2,254,379,000	28
119	41	Case Western Reserve University	1,841,234,000	35
120	47	Pennsylvania State University	1,590,000,000	45
122	53	University of Maryland, College Park	810,374,000	90
128	24	University of Virginia	4,370,209,000	20
129	23	Georgetown University	1,059,343,000	72
129	53	Ohio State University	2,338,103,000	27
140	17	Vanderbilt University	3,487,500,000	23
141	35	University of Rochester	1,726,318,000	38
160	28	Tufts University	1,452,058,000	48
161	46	University of California, Irvine*	..	..
166	102	University of Arizona	..	..
173	96	Stony Brook University	..	..
179	61	Texas A&M University***	..	..
183	66	Rutgers	654,184,000	110
186	77	University of Colorado at Boulder	716,656,000	95
193	71	Indiana University Bloomington	1,556,853,000	46
199	20	University of Notre Dame	5,976,973,000	14
		University of California System*	6,439,436,000	12
		University of Texas System**	15,613,672,000	5
		Texas A&M University System***	6,590,300,000	10
	Total		253,781,228,000	

Source: The University rankings data are compiled from, ."Times Higher Education-QS World University Rankings 2009: Top 200 World Universities," *Times Higher Education Supplement* (UK). Retrieved on October 8, 2009 from: http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/Rankings2009-Top200.html; The U.S. News and World Report Rankings data are compiled from, "Best Colleges: Top Public Schools: National Universities,"; " *U.S. News and World Report*. Retrieved on November 27, 2009 from:http://colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-colleges/national-top-public; The endowment data are compiled and computed from, "Table 359. Endowment funds of the 120 colleges and universities with the largest endowments, by rank order: 2006 and 2007," Digest of Education Statistics. U.S. National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved on October 26,2009 from: http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d08/tables_359.asp.

Colonial Heritage and the English Language

My analysis of the 32 nations with institutions among the top 200, shows that there is a phenomenon of Colonial Heritage. One can make a clear case especially for the United Kingdom. It appears as if a number of nations that were at one time territories or nations partly or fully colonized by the United Kingdom are among these 32 nations. Table 21shows the United Kingdom and 11 nations whose territories or the nations themselves were at one time in history partly or fully colonized by the United Kingdom. The countries or entities are: Australia, Canada, Hong Kong, India, Israel, Ireland, Malaysia, New Zealand, Singapore, South Africa, and the United States. Their combined population including the United Kingdom, in 2008 was 1.67 billion (24.9% of 6.71 billion world total). These 11 nations plus the United Kingdom have a total of 122 institutions (61%) among the top 200. Their combined GDP in 2008 was $24.017 trillion (44.4% of $54.132 and 34.2% of the $70.14 trillion world total) and their per capita GDP was $14,398 (Table 21).

Language

Language could be a potential contributor to an institution being included among the top 200 universities. This is especially so with the English language and it is a big part of the Anglo-American hegemony. Also, the importance of English in the scientific community has also produced many inequalities with respect to non-English speaking countries (Stiftel & Mukhopadhyay, 2007). This hegemony has been criticized in numerous academic studies or articles (Jiang, 2011; Salmi & Saroyan, 2007; Stiftel & Mukhopadhyay, 2007).

By the end of the first decade of the 21st century, English has become the most influential language in academia, business and cultural entertainment. Sweeting and Vickers (2007) quoted a scholar as saying of the British that: "'…most significant of all is the legacy of the school and university' and in particular the role of English as an international language"' (p. 1). In a review of Wierzbicka (2006) book, *English: Meaning and Culture*, Raumolin-Brunberg (2008) notes that: "…Wierzbicka speaks about 'Anglo' English and 'Anglo' culture, referring to the language and culture of the traditional bases of English: the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. She claims that Anglo English, like any language, is a result of its history, during which specific cultural meanings have developed" (p. 462). Moussu and Llurda (2008) write about the influence of the English language around the world, specifically how non-native English speakers perceive their fluency in English (also see Kirkptrick, 2007; Rubdy & Saraceni, 2006).

According to Altbach (2008), the dominance of the English language, especially as a language of academic instruction in dozens of nations is a post World War II phenomenon. Before that period, national languages were utilized by most nations as a language of instruction in universities. A similar pattern also emerged in terms of academic or scholarly publications, whereby English has emerged as the primary language utilized in such publications. Altbach (2008) concludes that without any real competition from another world language, the English language has now become the primary international language of academic instruction and publication: "Indeed, national academic systems enthusiastically welcome English as a contributor to internationalizing, competing, and becoming 'world class.'" Colonialism (in Asia, including parts of China such as Hong Kong, Africa, the Middle East, the Caribbean, North and South America, and elsewhere) is a major factor for this phenomenon (p. 56-57).

For example, some of the Asian nations with institutions ranked among the top 200 actually provide information on their institutions' websites either only in English or both English and their national language. These Asian institutions and nations include; India Institute of Technology, Delhi, India; National Taiwan University, Taiwan; Universiti Malaya, Malaysia; Yonsei University, South Korea; and the Hong Kong University of Science & Technology, Hong Kong. This influence of the

English language as a language of academic instruction is observed even in other European Union nations. For example, according to Seidlhofer et al. (2006), over 90% of students in secondary schools in European Union nations study English (In most cases as their first foreign language). Seidlhofer et al. (2006) conclude that "whether chosen or mandatory, English is unquestionably the dominant language in secondary education…" (p. 3-4).

Table 21

United Kingdom and nations at One Time in History that Had Territories Partly or Fully Colonized by the United Kingdom, Their Rankings in the 2009 THE-QS World University Top 200 Rankings, Population, GDP and GDP per Capita

Countries	University Number	Population 2008	GDP 2008est. $Billion	GDP Per Capita 2008 est.
UK	29	60,943,912	2,236	36,700
Australia	9	21,007,310	802.9	38,200
Canada	11	33,212,696	1,303	39,200
Hong Kong	5	7,018,636	307.3	43,800
India	2	1,147,995,904	3,304	2,900
Israel	3	7,112,359	203.4	28,600
Ireland	2	4,156,119	189	45,500
Malaysia	1	25,274,132	385.2	15,200
New Zealand	3	4,173,460	116.6	27,900
Singapore	2	4,608,167	237.9	51,600
South Africa	1	48,782,756	492.2	10,100
United States	54	303,824,640	14,440	47,500
Total/Average	122	1,668,110,091	24,017.50	14,398

Source: THE, 2009; 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook.

Table 22

Total Exports and Imports and Rank of Goods and Services of United Kingdom and Nations With Territories at One Time In History Partly or Fully Colonized by the United Kingdom With at Least One Institution Ranked in the 2009 THE-QS Top 200 World Universities, and Population in 2008

Nation	# of Institutions	%	Population 2008 est.	Exports 2008est $Billion	Per Capita $	Rank	Imports 2008 est. $Billion	Per Capita $	Rank
UK	29	15	60,943,912	466.3	7,651	21	639.3	10,490	15
USA	54	27	303,824,640	1,277	4,203	25	2,117	6,968	24
Canada	11	5.5	33,212,696	459.1	13,823	13	415.2	12,501	13
Australia	9	4.5	21,007,310	189.9	9,040	17	194.2	9,244	19
Hong Kong	5	2.5	7,018,636	365.2	52,033	2	388.4	55,338	2
Israel	3	1.5	7,112,359	57.16	7,964	19	64.4	9,042	20
New Zealand	3	1.5	4,173,460	31.19	7,473	22	32.76	7,850	23
India	2	1	1,147,995,904	187.9	164	32	315.1	275	32
Ireland	2	1	4,156,119	119.8	28,825	7	84.82	20,408	8
Singapore	2	1	4,608,167	342.7	74,368	1	309.6	67,185	1
Malaysia	1	0.5	25,274,132	198.7	7,862	20	154.7	6,121	25
South Africa	1	0.5	48,782,756	86.12	1,765	30	90.57	1,857	30
Total/Ave	122	61	1,668,110,091	3,781.07	2,267		4,802.05	2,879	

Source: THE, 2009; 2008 and 2009 CIA World Factbook.

Table 22 presents 2008 trade (exports and imports) figures of these 12 nations. Their combined exports in 2008 were $3.781 trillion (30.4% of $12.446 trillion and 23.6% of $16.040 trillion total) and their per capita exports were $2,267. Their combined imports were $4.802 (37.8% of 12.717 trillion and 30.1% of $15.970 trillion world total) and their GDP per capita Imports were $2,879 (Table 22).

Conclusion

This study has illustrated that in the 2009 *Times Higher Education*—QS Top 200 Universities, there is a clear example of Anglo-American hegemony. This Anglo-American hegemony appears to be relatively successful, because increasing numbers of nations in the World, including China, Mexico, Quatar, Indonesia and Brazil are implementing Anglo-American type University structures or strategic plans. One possible reason why some of these nations seem to attempt to emulate the universities of the United States and the United Kingdom is that in increasing numbers of instances, the students, professors, scholars and administrators in those institutions are from China, India, the Middle East, Africa, etcetera. Among the most prominent professors or administrators at highly ranked universities in the United States and United Kingdom are not people of European ancestry. New York City in the United States and London, England are the two most racially/ethnically and culturally diverse entities in the world (Agarwal & Winkler, 1984; Finkelstein, 2010; Jasso, 2009; Kaba, 2011, 2004).

This analysis points to factors that might have contributed to a nation having at least one university ranked in the top 200 world universities. Higher Gross Domestic Products (GDP) and GDP per capita were cited as contributing factors to a nation having at least one university ranked. The argument is that financing is an integral part of a university's success, and relatively wealthy nations may be in the position to invest substantially in at least a selected number of their universities. Another factor cited as contributing to a nation having at least one university ranked in the top 200 is higher levels of trade (exports/imports). The argument here is that a nation's universities contribute to its economic success because it is those institutions that educate or train the workforce and the civil servants who produce the goods and services of the country.

Additional factors cited as contributing to a nation having at least one university ranked in the top 200 are population size of a nation, level of **authoritarianism**[8], age of an institution, colonial heritage, endowment of an institution, and language (English). For developed nations such as the United States, the United Kingdom, Japan, and Germany, a good argument can be made that their relatively large size contributed to them having many universities ranked in the top 200. However, that claim cannot be convincingly made for China and India. The age of an institution must be considered as a factor contributing to a nation having at least one university ranked in the top 200. This is because an old institution might have established a particular type of reputation, which attracts excellent students, administrators and professors and scholars. Also in the context of the United States and the United Kingdom, the older a university is the more likely that it has established large endowments. Colonial heritage was also noted as a factor because six out of every ten of the 200 universities are found to be linked to the United Kingdom either as a formal colony or as a country today where Queen Elizabeth of England is the ceremonial Head of State. This

[8] Authoritarianism is a factor that can contribute to some nations having fewer universities ranked or not having a single university ranked at all. Authoritarian regimes tend to repress students, college administrators or professors because of their views increasing "Brain Drain" whereby the most educated or skilled citizen will flee such nations.

brings us to the English Language cited as a contributing factor for a nation to have at least one university ranked in the top 200. The data tend to illustrate that utilizing English as a medium of instruction and publishing in academic journals and books in English contributes to a nation having at least one university ranked.

This study argues that the *Times Higher Education* world universities rankings are very influential and that one can clearly argue that it plays a very leading role in the Anglo-American hegemony in international higher education. The significant number of academic articles focusing on various important aspects of the *Times Higher Education* world universities rankings illustrates its international influence and reach. One can present an argument that the *Times Higher Education* world universities rankings have a number of interrelated or inter-connected policy implications. One such policy implication relates to its influence on individual students and their families consulting these rankings as a guide to determine which institution to attend. Another important policy implication is that these rankings influence universities all across the world to either revise their strategic plans or establish new ones in a way that would produce results that would meet the criteria of the *Times Higher Education* for potential inclusion in its rankings. One final important policy implication is that the *Times Higher Education* world universities rankings can influence governments and corporations in countries across the world to send their talented or brightest students to these top 200 universities to earn their undergraduate and graduate degrees. Part of the reason for such a policy is that when these students graduate and go back home, they can then represent their nations and corporations at important international political and economic summits or negotiations or meetings where their counterparts are also very likely to be graduates of these same universities.

References

Agarwal, V. B. & Winkler, D. R. (1984). Migration of professional manpower to the United States. *Southern Economic Journal*, 50, 814-830.

Altbach, P. G. (2008). The imperial tongue: English as the dominating academic language. *International Educator*, 17, 56-59.

Altbach, P. G. (2006). Tiny at the top. *The Wilson Quarterly*, 30, 49-51.

Altbach, P. G. (2005). India: A world-class country without world-class higher education. *International Educator*, 14, 14-17.

Ashbolt, A. (2007). Hegemony and the sixties: Observations, polemics, meanderings. *Rethinking Marxism*, 19, 208-220.

Barrows, J. (2009). Success among the elite: What drives the growth of large endowments? *Yale Economic Review 5*(2), 6.

Boothman, D. (2008). The sources for Gramsci's concept of hegemony. *Rethinking Marxism*, 20, 201-215.

Bill, J. A. (2001). The politics of hegemony: The United States and Iran. *Middle East Policy*, 8, 89-100.

Brezis, E. S. & Crouzet, F. (2004). The role of higher education institutions: Recruitment of elites and economic growth. CESIFO Working Paper No. 1360. www.CESifo.de

Buckel, S. & Fischer-Lescano, A. (2009). Preview Gramsci reconsidered: Hegemony in global law. *Leiden Journal of International Law*, 22, 437-454.

Cantwell, B., and Maldonodo-Maldonado, A. (2009). Four stories: Confronting contemporary ideas about globalisation and internationalisation in higher education. *Globalization, Societies and Education*, 7, 289-306.

Charon, A. & Wauters, J.-P. (2008). University ranking: a new tool for the evaluation of higher education in Europe. *Nephrology Dialysis Transplantation*, 23, 62-64.

Clark, H. R. (2007). How the *U.S. News* rankings affect American legal education. *Judicature*, 91, 80-85.

College Rankings Criticized. (2007). *Journal of Development Education*, 31, 40.

Collins, C. S. & Rhoads, R. A. (2010). The World Bank, support for universities, and asymmetrical power relations in international development. *High Education*, 59, 181–205.

Consalvo, M. (1998). Hegemony, domestic violence, and cops: A critique of concordance. *Journal of Popular Film & Television*, 26, 62-70.

Cramer, K. M. & Page, S. (2007). Calibrating Canadian universities: Rankings for sale once again. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 22, 4-13.

Deem, R., Mok, K. H., & Lucas, L. (2008). Transforming higher education in whose image? Exploring the concept of the 'world-class' university in Europe and Asia. *Higher Education Policy*, 21, 83-97.

Finkelstein, M. J. (2010). Diversification in the academic workforce: The case of the US and implications for Europe. *European Review*, 18, S142-S156.

Franco, M. E. D. P., & Morosini, M. C. (1992). Social pressures and university responses: The role of institutional evaluation. *Higher Education Policy*, 5, 70-72.

Gose, Ben. (2000, January 14). Measuring the value of an ivy degree. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 46, A52.

Gunn, S. (2006). From hegemony to governmentality: Changing conceptions of power in social history. *Journal of Social History*, 39, 705-720.

Hawthorne, L. (2007). Foreign credential recognition and assessment: An introduction. *Canadian Issues*, Spring, 3-13.

Jasso, G. (2009). Ethnicity and the immigration of highly skilled workers to the United States. *International Journal of Manpower*. 30, 26-42.

Jiang, Z. (2011). A research and counter-measures of English cultural hegemony in China. *Asian Social Science*, 7, 194-200.

Joseph, J. (2002). *Hegemony Analysis*. London, UK: Routledge.

Kaba, A. J. (2011). The status of Africa's emigration brain drain in the 21st Century. *Western Journal of Black Studies,* 35, 187-207.

Kaba, A. J. (2004). Africa's migration brain drain: The costs and benefits to the continent. *Chimera*, 2, 19-30.

Kamara, M. (2007). Are *U.S. News*' Rankings inherently biased against black colleges. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, 24, 8.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for International Communication and English Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kumar, T. K. V. & Verma, A. (2009). Hegemony, discipline and control in the administration of police in colonial India. *Asian Criminology,* 4, 61-78.

Lang, D. W. (2005). "World Class" or the curse of comparison?. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 35, 27-55.

Lang, D. W., and Zha, Q. (2004). Comparing universities: A case study between Canada and China. *Higher Education Policy*, 17, 339-354.

Larsen, P. V. (2003). Academic reputation: How *U.S. News & World Report* survey respondents form perceptions. *The CASE International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 4, 155-164.

Lo, W. Y. W. (2011). Soft power, university rankings and knowledge production: distinctions between hegemony and self-determination in higher education. Comparative Education, 47, 209-222.

Marginson, S. (2007). Global position and position taking: The case of Australia. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 5-32.

Mohrman, K. (2008). The emerging global model with Chinese characteristics. *Higher Education Policy*, 21, 29-48.

Moussu, L. & Llurda, E. (2008). Non-native English-speaking English language teachers: History and research, *Language Teaching*, 41, 348.

Olaniran, B. A. & Agnello, M. F. (2008). Globalization, educational hegemony, and higher education," *Multicultural Education & Technology*, 2, 68-86.

Poh, L. C. (2010). Singapore betting on biomedical science. *Issues in Science and Technology*, 26, 69-74.

Raumolin-Brunberg, H. (2008). English: Meaning and culture. Book Review. *Language in Society*, 37, 462-465.

Rezende, S. M. (2010). Brazil: Challenges and achievements. *Issues in Science and Technology*, 26, 61-68.

Rubdy, R. & Saraceni, M. (eds). (2006). *English in the World: Global Rules, Global Roles*. New York: Continuum Press.

Salmi, J. & Saroyan, A. (2007). League tables as policy instruments: The political economy of accountability in tertiary education. In *Global University Network for Innovation (GUNI), Higher education in the world. Accreditation for quality assurance: What is at stake?* New York: MacMillan, pp. 79-96.

Seidlhofer, B., Breiteneder, A., & Pitzl, M.-L. (2006). English as a lingua franca in Europe: Challenges for applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 3-34.

Sementelli, A. J. (2005). Critical theory, institutions, and hegemony: Role obligated and the reconciliation of seemingly incompatible goals. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, 8, 559-576.

Standifird, S. S. (2005). Reputation among peer academic institutions: An investigation of the *US News and World Report's* Rankings. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 8, 233-244.

Stiftel, B., & Mukhopadhyay, C. (2007). Thoughts on Anglo-American hegemony in planning scholarship. *Town Planning Review* 78, 545-572.

Swartz, D. L. (2008). Social closure in American elite higher education. *Theory & Society*, 37, 409-419.

Sweeting, A. & Vickers, E. (2007). Language and the history of colonial education: The case of Hong Kong," *Modern Asian Studies*, 41, 1-40.

Sweitzer, K. & Volkwein, J. F. (2009). Prestige among graduate and professional schools: Comparing the *U.S. News'* graduate school reputation ratings between disciplines. *Research in Higher Education*, 50, 812-836.

The Ticker (2009) "American universities – and Oxford – slip in latest 'Top 200' List," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. The Ticker. Retrieved on October 8, 2009 from: http://chronicle.com/blog/The-Ticker/1/2/.

Wangenge-Ouma, G. & Langa, P. V. (2010). Universities and the mobilization of claims of excellence for competitive advantage. *Higher Education*, 59, 749-764.

Watson, P. (2009). Regional themes and global means in supranational higher education policy. *Higher Education*, 58, 419-438.

Wierzbicka, A. (2006). *English: Meaning and Culture*. Oxford; Oxford University Press.

Ying, C. & Niancai, L. (2008). Tracking the development of China's top universities using scientometric indicators, 1997-2005. *Frontiers of Education in China,* 3, 415-428.

Appendices

Appendix A

List of all institutions ranked in Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 Universities in the World in 2009, U.S. News and World Report College Rankings for the U.S. Institutions on the list: 2010 (also under the U.S. News and World Report Rankings are rankings of the top U.S. public/state institutions in parenthesis with asterisk on the list), Country of Institutions, and World Region of Country

2009 Rank	2010 *U.S. News* Rank	Institution	Country	World Regions SubRegion
1	1	Harvard University	US	Northern America
2		University of Cambridge	UK	Northern Europe
3	3	Yale University	US	Northern America
4		University College London	UK	Northern Europe
5		Imperial College London	UK	Northern Europe
5		University of Oxford	UK	Northern Europe
7	8	University of Chicago	US	Northern America
8	1	Princeton University	US	Northern America
9	4	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	US	Northern America
10	4	California Institute of Technology	US	Northern America
11	8	Columbia University	US	Northern America
12	4	University of Pennsylvania	US	Northern America
13	14	Johns Hopkins University	US	Northern America
14	10	Duke University	US	Northern America
15	15	Cornell University	US	Northern America
16	4	Stanford University	US	Northern America
17		Australian National University	Australia	Oceania/A &NZ

Appendix A (continued)

List of all institutions ranked in Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 Universities in the World in 2009, U.S. News and World Report College Rankings for the U.S. Institutions on the list: 2010 (also under the U.S. News and World Report Rankings are rankings of the top U.S. public/state institutions in parenthesis with asterisk on the list), Country of Institutions, and World Region of Country

2009 Rank	2010 *U.S. News* Rank	Institution	Country	World Regions SubRegion
18		McGill University	Canada	Northern America
19	27 (4)*	University of Michigan	US	Northern America
20		University of Edinburgh	UK	Northern Europe
20		ETH Zurich (Swiss Federa/Institute of Technology)	Switzerland	Western Europe
22		University of Tokyo	Japan	Eastern Asia
23		King's College London	UK	Northern Europe
24		University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong	Eastern Asia
25		Kyoto University	Japan	Eastern Asia
26		University of Manchester	UK	Northern Europe
27	22	Carnegie Mellon University	US	Northern America
28		Ecole Normale Supérieure, Paris	France	Western Europe
29		University of Toronto	Canada	Northern America
30		National University of Singapore	Singapore	South Eastern Asia
31	16	Brown University	US	Northern America
32	24 (2)*	UCLA	US	Northern America
32	12	Northwestern University	US	Northern America
34		University of Bristol	UK	Northern Europe
35		Hong Kong University of Science and Technology	Hong Kong	Eastern Asia
36		Ecole Polytechnique	France	Western Europe

Appendix A (continued)

List of all institutions ranked in Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 Universities in the World in 2009, U.S. News and World Report College Rankings for the U.S. Institutions on the list: 2010 (also under the U.S. News and World Report Rankings are rankings of the top U.S. public/state institutions in parenthesis with asterisk on the list), Country of Institutions, and World Region of Country

2009 Rank	2010 *U.S. News* Rank	Institution	Country	World Regions SubRegion
36		University of Melbourne	Australia	Oceania/A &NZ
36		University of Sydney	Australia	Oceania/A &NZ
39	21 (1)*	University of California, Berkeley	US	Northern America
40		University of British Columbia	Canada	Northern America
41		University of Queensland	Australia	Oceania/A &NZ
42		Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne	France	Western Europe
43		Osaka University	Japan	Eastern Asia
43		Trinity College Dublin	Ireland	Northern Europe
45		Monash University	Australia	Oceania/A &NZ
46		Chinese University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong	Eastern Asia
47		University of New South Wales	Australia	Oceania/A &NZ
47		Seoul National University	South Korea	Eastern Asia
49		University of Amsterdam	Netherlands	Western Europe
49		Tsinghua University	China	Eastern Asia
51		University of Copenhagen	Denmark	Northern Europe
52	32	New York University	US	Northern America
52		Peking University	China	Eastern Asia
54	56	Boston University	US	Northern America
55		Technical University of Munich	Germany	Western Europe
55		Tokyo Institute of Technology	Japan	Eastern Asia

Appendix A (continued)

List of all institutions ranked in Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 Universities in the World in 2009, U.S. News and World Report College Rankings for the U.S. Institutions on the list: 2010 (also under the U.S. News and World Report Rankings are rankings of the top U.S. public/state institutions in parenthesis with asterisk on the list), Country of Institutions, and World Region of Country

2009 Rank	2010 *U.S. News* Rank	Institution	Country	World Regions SubRegion
57		Heidelberg University	Germany	Western Europe
58		University of Warwick	UK	Northern Europe
59		University of Alberta	Canada	Northern America
60		Leiden University	Netherlands	Western Europe
61		University of Auckland	New Zealand	Oceania/A &NZ
61	39 (9)*	University of Wisconsin-Madison	US	Northern America
63		Aarhus University	Denmark	Northern Europe
63	39 (9)*	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	US	Northern America
65		Katholieke Universiteit Leuven	Belgium	Western Europe
66		University of Birmingham	UK	Northern Europe
67		London School of Economics	UK	Northern Europe
67		Lund University	Sweden	Northern Europe
69		Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology	South Korea	Eastern Asia
70		Utrecht University	Netherlands	Western Europe
70		University of York	UK	Northern Europe
72		University of Geneva	Switzerland	Western Europe
73		Nanyang Technological University	Singapore	South Eastern Asia
73	12	Washington University in St Louis	US	Northern America

Appendix A (continued)

List of all institutions ranked in Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 Universities in the World in 2009, U.S. News and World Report College Rankings for the U.S. Institutions on the list: 2010 (also under the U.S. News and World Report Rankings are rankings of the top U.S. public/state institutions in parenthesis with asterisk on the list), Country of Institutions, and World Region of Country

2009 Rank	2010 *U.S. News* Rank	Institution	Country	World Regions SubRegion
75		Uppsala University	Sweden	Northern Europe
76	35 (7)*	University of California, San Diego	US	Northern America
76	47 (15)*	University of Texas at Austin	US	Northern America
78	28 (5)*	University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	US	Northern America
79		University of Glasgow	UK	Northern Europe
80	42 (11)*	University of Washington	US	Northern America
81		University of Adelaide	Australia	Oceania/A &NZ
82		University of Sheffield	UK	Northern Europe
83		Delft University of Technology	Netherlands	Western Europe
84		University of Western Australia	Australia	Oceania/A &NZ
85	11	Dartmouth College	US	Northern America
86	35 (7)*	Georgia Institute of Technology	US	Northern America
87	61 (22)*	Purdue University	US	Northern America
87		University of St Andrews	UK	Northern Europe
89		University College Dublin	Ireland	Northern Europe
90	17	Emory University	US	Northern America
91		University of Nottingham	UK	Northern Europe
92		Nagoya University	Japan	Eastern Asia

Appendix A (continued)

List of all institutions ranked in Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 Universities in the World in 2009, U.S. News and World Report College Rankings for the U.S. Institutions on the list: 2010 (also under the U.S. News and World Report Rankings are rankings of the top U.S. public/state institutions in parenthesis with asterisk on the list), Country of Institutions, and World Region of Country

2009 Rank	2010 *U.S. News* Rank	Institution	Country	World Regions SubRegion
92		University of Zurich	Switzerland	Western Europe
94		Free University of Berlin	Germany	Western Europe
95		University of Southampton	UK	Northern Europe
95		National Taiwan University	Taiwan	Eastern Asia
97		Tohoku University	Japan	Eastern Asia
98		Ludwig-Maximilians University, Munich	Germany	Western Europe
99		University of Leeds	UK	Northern Europe
100	17	Rice University	US	Northern America
101		University of Oslo	Norway	Northern Europe
102		Hebrew University of Jerusalem	Israel	Western Asia
103		Durham University	UK	Northern Europe
103		Fudan University	China	Eastern Asia
105	61 (22)*	University of Minnesota	US	Northern America
106	42 (11)*	University of California, Santa Barbara	US	Northern America
107		Université de Montréal	Canada	Northern America
108		University of Basel	Switzerland	Western Europe
108	42 (11)*	University of California, Davis	US	Northern America
108		Erasmus University Rotterdam	Netherlands	Western Europe
108		University of Helsinki	Finland	Northern Europe

Appendix A (continued)

List of all institutions ranked in Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 Universities in the World in 2009, U.S. News and World Report College Rankings for the U.S. Institutions on the list: 2010 (also under the U.S. News and World Report Rankings are rankings of the top U.S. public/state institutions in parenthesis with asterisk on the list), Country of Institutions, and World Region of Country

2009 Rank	2010 *U.S. News* Rank	Institution	Country	World Regions SubRegion
112	26	University of Southern California	US	Northern America
113		University of Waterloo	Canada	Northern America
114	56 (20)*	University of Pittsburgh	US	Northern America
114		Tel Aviv University	Israel	Western Asia
116		Maastricht University	Netherlands	Western Europe
117		Université Pierre-et-Marie-Curie Paris VI	France	Western Europe
118		Queen's University	Canada	Northern America
119	41	Case Western Reserve University	US	Northern America
120		Eindhoven University of Technology	Netherlands	Western Europe
120	47 (15)*	Pennsylvania State University	US	Northern America
122		Freiburg University	Germany	Western Europe
122	53 (18)*	University of Maryland, College Park	US	Northern America
124		City University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong	Eastern Asia
125		University of Otago	New Zealand	Oceania/A &NZ
126		Université Catholique de Louvain	Belgium	Western Europe
126		Ecole Normale Supérieure de Lyon	France	Western Europe
128	24 (2)*	University of Virginia	US	Northern America
129		University of Aberdeen	UK	Northern Europe

Appendix A (continued)

List of all institutions ranked in Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 Universities in the World in 2009, U.S. News and World Report College Rankings for the U.S. Institutions on the list: 2010 (also under the U.S. News and World Report Rankings are rankings of the top U.S. public/state institutions in parenthesis with asterisk on the list), Country of Institutions, and World Region of Country

2009 Rank	2010 *U.S. News* Rank	Institution	Country	World Regions SubRegion
129	23	Georgetown University	US	Northern America
129	53 (18)*	Ohio State University	US	Northern America
132		Technion – Israel Institute of Technology	Israel	Western Asia
132		University of Vienna	Austria	Western Europe
134		Pohang University of Science and Technology	South Korea	Eastern Asia
135		Cardiff University	UK	Northern Europe
136		University of Ghent	Belgium	Western Europe
137		University of Liverpool	UK	Northern Europe
138		Chulalongkorn University	Thailand	South Eastern Asia
138		University of Groningen	Netherlands	Western Europe
140	17	Vanderbilt University	US	Northern Europe
141		University of Rochester	US	Northern America
142		Keio University	Japan	Eastern Asia
143		McMaster University	Canada	Northern America
144		University of Bath	UK	Northern Europe
144		University of Bergen	Norway	Northern Europe
146		University of Cape Town	South Africa	Southern Africa
146		Humboldt University of Berlin	Germany	Western Europe

Appendix A (continued)

List of all institutions ranked in Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 Universities in the World in 2009, U.S. News and World Report College Rankings for the U.S. Institutions on the list: 2010 (also under the U.S. News and World Report Rankings are rankings of the top U.S. public/state institutions in parenthesis with asterisk on the list), Country of Institutions, and World Region of Country

2009 Rank	2010 *U.S. News* Rank	Institution	Country	World Regions SubRegion
148		Waseda University	Japan	Eastern Asia
149		University of Calgary	Canada	Northern America
149		Eberhard Karls University of Tübingen	Germany	Western Europe
151		University of Western Ontario	Canada	Northern America
151		Yonsei University	South Korea	Eastern Asia
153		Shanghai Jiao Tong University	China	Eastern Asia
154		University of Science and Technology of China	China	Eastern Asia
155		Kyushu University	Japan	Eastern Asia
155		Lomonosov Moscow State University	Russia	Eastern Europe
155		Wageningen University	Netherlands	Western Europe
158		Newcastle University	UK	Northern Europe
159		Technical University of Denmark	Denmark	Northern Europe
160	28	Tufts University	US	Northern America
161	46 (14)*	University of California, Irvine	US	Northern America
162		Lancaster University	UK	Northern Europe
163		Indian Institute of Technology Bombay	India	South Asia
164		Queen Mary, University of London	UK	Northern Europe
165		VU University Amsterdam	Netherlands	Western Europe
166	102 (48)*	University of Arizona	US	Northern America

Appendix A (continued)

List of all institutions ranked in Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 Universities in the World in 2009, U.S. News and World Report College Rankings for the U.S. Institutions on the list: 2010 (also under the U.S. News and World Report Rankings are rankings of the top U.S. public/state institutions in parenthesis with asterisk on the list), Country of Institutions, and World Region of Country

2009 Rank	2010 *U.S. News* Rank	Institution	Country	World Regions SubRegion
166		University of Sussex	UK	Northern Europe
168		University of Lausanne	Switzerland	Western Europe
168		Nanjing University	China	Eastern Asia
168		Saint-Petersburg State University	Russia	Eastern Europe
171		University of Barcelona	Spain	Southern Europe
171		Hokkaido University	Japan	Eastern Asia
173	96 (43)*	Stony Brook University	US	Northern America
174		University of Bologna	Italy	Southern Europe
174		KTH, Royal Institute of Technology	Sweden	Northern Europe
174		University of Tsukuba	Japan	Eastern Asia
177		University of Antwerp	Belgium	Western Europe
177		University of Athens	Greece	Southern Europe
179	61 (22)*	Texas A&M University	US	Northern America
180		Universiti Malaya	Malaysia	South Eastern Asia
181		Indian Institute of Technology Delhi	India	South Asia
182		Rheinisch-Westfälische Technische Hochschule Aachen	Germany	Western Europe
183	66 (26)*	Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	US	Northern America
184		University of Karlsruhe	Germany	Western Europe
185		University of Gothenburg	Sweden	Northern Europe

Appendix A (continued)

List of all institutions ranked in Times Higher Education-QS Top 200 Universities in the World in 2009, U.S. News and World Report College Rankings for the U.S. Institutions on the list: 2010 (also under the U.S. News and World Report Rankings are rankings of the top U.S. public/state institutions in parenthesis with asterisk on the list), Country of Institutions, and World Region of Country

2009 Rank	2010 *U.S. News* Rank	Institution	Country	World Regions SubRegion
186	77 (34)*	University of Colorado at Boulder	US	Northern America
186		University of Göttingen	Germany	Western Europe
188		University of Canterbury	New Zealand	Oceania/A &NZ
189		Macquarie University	Australia	Oceania/A &NZ
190		National Autonomous University of Mexico	Mexico	Central America
191		Université Libre de Bruxelles	Belgium	Western Europe
191		University of Reading	UK	Northern Europe
193		University of Bern	Switzerland	Western Europe
193	71 (29)*	Indiana University Bloomington	US	Northern America
195		Hong Kong Polytechnic University	Hong Kong	Eastern Asia
196		University of Leicester	UK	Northern Europe
196		Simon Fraser University	Canada	Northern America
198		Chalmers University of Technology	Sweden	Northern Europe
199	20	University of Notre Dame	US	Northern America
200		University of Twente	Netherlands	Western Europe

Source: "Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions,"; THE, 2009;
The numbers in parenthesis with the asterisk next to them are the ranking of the U.S. Public or State Universities: "Best Colleges: Top Public Schools: National Universities," ;*" U.S. News and World Report*. Retrieved on November 27, 2009 from:http://colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-colleges/national-top-public.

Appendix B.

Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings

Nations, Territories and Entities plus Taiwan (N=238)

Africa (n=57)

Eastern Africa (n=19)
Burundi, Comoros, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Reunion, Rwanda, Seychelles, Somalia, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Mayotte.
Middle Africa (n=9)
Angola, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Republic of Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon and Sao Tome & Principe
Northern Africa (n=7)
Algeria, Egypt, Libya, Morocco, Sudan, Tunisia and Western Sahara
Southern Africa (n=5)
Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, South Africa and Swaziland
Western Africa (n=17)
Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Cote d'Ivoire, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo and Saint Helena.

Americas N=53

Latin America and the Caribbean (n=48)
Caribbean (n=26)
Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, Aruba, Bahamas, Barbados, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guadeloupe, Haiti, Jamaica, Martinique, Montserrat, Netherlands Antilles, Puerto Rico, Saint-Barthélemy, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Martin (French part), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago, Turks and Caicos Islands, United States Virgin Islands,
Central America (n=8)
Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama
South America (n=14)
Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Falkland Islands (Malvinas), French Guiana, Guyana, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).
Northern America (n=5)
Bermuda, Canada, Greenland, Saint Pierre and Miquelon, United States of America

Asia (N=51)

Central Asia (n=5)
Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan
Eastern Asia (n=8)

China, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of China, Macao Special Administrative Region of China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Japan, Mongolia, Republic of Korea, Taiwan* (As noted in the methodology, I added Taiwan to Eastern Asia)

Southern Asia (n=9)

Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka

South-Eastern Asia (n=11)

Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Viet Nam

Western Asia (n=18)

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Cyprus, Georgia, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Occupied Palestinian Territory (Gaza and the West Bank), Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Yemen.

Europe (N=52)

Eastern Europe (n=10)

Belarus, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Ukraine.

Northern Europe (n=17)

Åland Islands, Channel Islands, Denmark, Estonia, Faeroe Islands, Finland, Guernsey, Iceland, Ireland, Isle of Man, Jersey, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Svalbard and Jan Mayen Islands, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Southern Europe (n=16)

Albania, Andorra, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Gibraltar, Greece, Holy See, Italy, Malta, Montenegro, Portugal, San Marino, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

Western Europe (n=9)

Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Switzerland.

Oceania (N= 25)

Australia and New Zealand (n=3)

Australia, New Zealand, Norfolk Island.

Melanesia (n=5)

Fiji, New Caledonia, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu.

Micronesia (n=7)

Guam, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau

Polynesia (10)

American Samoa, Cook Islands, French Polynesia, Niue, Pitcairn, Samoa, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu, Wallis and Futuna Islands

Source: "Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings" Retrieved on November 15, 2009 from: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm.

Appendix C

Four Geographic Regions of the United States (N=51)

Northeast (n=9)

Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont.

Midwest (n=12)

Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North, Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin.

South (n=17)

Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia.

West (n=13)

Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming.

Source: "Summary Social, Economic, and Housing Characteristics: 2000 Census of Population and Housing," (2003, June). Selected Appendixes: 2000. PHC-2-A. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau.

About the Author

Dr. Amadu Jacky Kaba

Seton Hall University

Email: kabaamad@shu.edu

Amadu Jacky Kaba is an Associate Professor of Sociology at Seton Hall University, in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work. Prior to returning to Seton Hall University in 2005, he worked (Post-Doctoral Fellowship) with the renowned Social Scientist, Professor Ali A. Mazrui, teaching and conducting research in the Social Sciences both at Binghamton University, State University of New York, and Cornell University in Ithaca, New York, from July 2002 to June 30, 2005. Kaba earned all of his degrees from Seton Hall University: B.A. in Political Science in 1997; Masters in Public Administration in 1998; and Ph.D. in Higher Education Leadership, Management and Policy in May 2002.

education policy analysis archives

Volume 20 Number 21 July 30th 2012 ISSN 1068-2341